

313

THE

REFORMED QUARTERLY REVIEW

NO. 1.—JANUARY, 1892.

I.

WHAT IS THE BIBLE?

BY PROF. THOMAS G. APPLE, D.D., LL.D.

THE Bible is *the Book*. This title, which it has acquired for itself the world over, implies that it is unique as compared with all other books. It is the book in a preëminent sense. The first construction that might be put upon this title is, that it is the book containing the record of a religion, the Christian religion. As the Vedas contain the religion of the East, or the Koran the religion of Mohammed, so the Bible is the authority for the religion of Christ.

But upon closer inquiry we learn that there is a higher sense in which the Bible is called the book, just as Christianity is not only a religion among other religions, but is the only absolute religion. As religions in general claim to be based upon some revelation of truth, whether through natural or supernatural means—that is, whether through the natural genius and intuition of some mind, some great man, or through some divine agency—so Christianity claims to be based upon the only absolute revelation. It claims to contain the truth as

revealed in a supernatural way to man from God from the beginning of the world, and culminating in the revelation in the person of the Lord Jesus Christ. Other religions are the expression of the natural religious intuitions of man, projections, as it were, of his natural religious wants, and therefore mere forms without substantial contents. It may, indeed, be allowed that there are intermingled in these religions some elements of a primitive revelation made to man, but lost as to its substance through the lapse of the nations into unbelief. St. Paul says of those nations, called the Gentiles, that they *would* not retain the knowledge of God in their hearts, and that therefore God had given them over to the blindness of unbelief. As distinguished, then, from the books of all other religions, the Bible contains the one only true and infallible revelation which God has made to the world.

One peculiarity of the Bible is that, as the revelation it records was a progressive revelation, so the Bible is composed of sections, or books, that were prepared by different authors and in different ages. Criticism has not even as yet satisfactorily settled the precise time when each of its books was written, but it is known that the whole time extended over a long series of ages, reaching from the time of Moses to the closing years of the first century of the Christian era. "God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in a Son," i. e., one who occupies the relation of sonship. The record kept pace with the revelation. What God revealed in various ways, as in theophanies, dreams, &c., was preserved in tradition, and handed down in different writings. These writings did not pretend at any one time to contain the absolute fulness of divine revelation, but only what was made known at the time, and in the measure, or degree, in which it was made known. Not until this revelation reached its absolute fulness in the incarnation of the Son of God, in the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, was the record closed as complete and final.

It might be inferred from what has now been said that the recorded revelation contained in the Bible would be characterized by the circumstances of the times in which it was produced. The revelation itself would be thus affected, and consequently its apprehension, reproduction, and record, would necessarily share in the same modification. God could not reveal Himself in any greater degree than men were prepared for the revelation. Hence in its first stages this revelation would appear as imperfect and crude to a later age. The world had a childhood, youth, and mature age, just as the individual man has. No other religion claims to have a revelation of such continuous character, one and the same, from the beginning of the world. The fact that Christianity alone claims this raises the presumption that it really possesses such a revelation. Where else would such a claim come from if not from the fact itself, the actual existence, of such a revelation?

We are now prepared to consider what we may designate the fullness or completeness of the revelation contained in the Bible. It is at once evident that such fullness or completeness cannot be predicated of any one portion of the Bible taken by itself. Such part cannot be complete simply because it is a part and not the whole. The absolute revelation was made by, and is contained in, the person of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the *whole* Bible *only* can contain the record of this revelation in its wholeness, so far at least as such revelation of a living person can be given in the form of the written word. We must grant that even in its wholeness the Bible is not commensurate with the revelation in Christ, but we can say that for human apprehension all is given in the Bible which it is necessary for man to know, for the purposes for which the Bible was given. In this sense we may say that the revelation recorded in the Bible is complete.

The question may be raised here, whether there is any revelation made by the glorified Christ, in addition to, or over and above, what is given in the Bible? and if so, in what sense? No one would say that any book, or myriad of books, could

contain all that is revealed in the divine-human person of Christ. And yet, when that mystery is recorded by inspiration, as by the writers of the Bible, may it not contain in substance the whole truth of revelation, and that what remains now is simply the development of the apprehension of that mystery, on the basis of what is revealed? Even those who were confronted by the person of the Lord could not apprehend the fullness of His person, yet the confession of Peter, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," contains the substance of the absolute revelation.

The Bible, then, we may say, is a complete revelation. Hence it is closed as *the sacred canon*. The books it contains have been determined and fixed as differing from all uninspired writings. There is a difference, indeed, between the Roman Catholic and the Protestant church as to the number of inspired books in the Bible, the former including the Apocrypha, the latter excluding it. But the completeness of the Bible does not necessarily depend on the mere fixing of the number of books it contains. We know that at least one of St. Paul's epistles has been lost, and yet this fact does not detract from the wholeness of the Bible. And so, if an epistle were now discovered, it would not add to, or change, the wholeness of the Bible, because we know of a surety that it would make no change substantially in what is given to us in the Bible. We cannot say that it was absolutely necessary that St. Paul should write just so many, and no more nor less, epistles. The New Testament would not lose its wholeness by the omission of the epistle to Philemon, by which we do not mean that important and necessary truth is not contained in that epistle. But we may believe that the church, to whom the revelation was entrusted, preserved this revelation in its wholeness, and that the Bible contains the whole revelation of God to man.

When we say that the Bible is a closed canon, we mean that the revelation our Saviour gave to His disciples was the whole revelation He designed to give to man in that form. That, indeed, is one of the characteristics of the apostles, that to them

was entrusted the whole revelation He designed to make. For this purpose they were called to be personal witnesses of His life, and for this end they were specially inspired to apprehend and make known the revelation. In order to have any additional revelation, it would be necessary to have another inspired apostolate; in short, another opening of the New Testament dispensation, with miracles, charisms, and all that belonged to that opening. The New Testament is, in a sense, the perpetuation of the apostolate in the church. The apostles were the inspired teachers in laying the foundation of the church, and of this we may say, "No other foundation can be laid than that which is laid." The church is still inspired in a general sense, and inspired talent and genius may discover new truth in the Bible, and make it known, but no one may be expected to reveal new substantial truth, because the apostolate is past. The apostolic age was unique in this respect, and it will not be repeated. The *Irvingites*, we know, sprang up as a sect some years ago in Europe, and based themselves upon the idea that the apostolate is to be continued. They appointed apostles, (just what was not done in the apostolic age, for it was their peculiar characteristic that they were appointed directly by Christ, except in the case of Matthias, and it is particularly stated that he was a witness of the life of Christ) and aimed to continue their sect on that basis. But this sect has ceased to exist because it was based on a fallacy.

This, then, is what we mean when we say the Bible is a *closed canon*, in answer to the question, What is the Bible? It is a completed book, and therefore it is, as the Reformers held and Protestants now hold, the complete and only infallible rule of faith and practice.

In taking this position, do we detract from the infinite and absolute fullness of the glorified Christ? Is He not more than the Bible? and must not that revelation which advanced in stages in times past continue to go on as the Church approaches its own glorification? In answer we would say, that revelation was progressive down to the coming of Christ, but He was and

is the end of revelation, and His Word is in a sense Himself, and when He gave us His last word, He Himself closed His own revelation until He come again in glory.

It follows, then, that while the revelation in the Bible is objectively complete, yet subjectively in the mind of the Church the revelation given will reach new and higher stages of apprehension. And this, we know, is sometimes called new revelation, for, it is said, revelation implies a making known, and therefore that which is not known, or apprehended, is not revealed. But we must make a distinction here between a revelation as *subjective* and an *objective* revelation. Christ had fully revealed Himself when He ascended up on high, that is, as an objective revelation, but that revelation was not fully apprehended subjectively by His disciples. In this subjective sense revelation is still progressive, whilst nothing new is added as to the substance of what is already revealed.

An illustration of this difference appears in the revelation in the Gospels as compared with the Epistles. The Epistles are subjective. They unfold the truth contained in the Gospels, but they add nothing to the substance of the Gospels. Weiss maintains, we know, that the Gospels are quite as subjective as the Epistles, and that, therefore, the Epistles are a higher, a more advanced revelation than the Gospels. This is true in a sense, but the Gospels make known to us what came from without, from Christ, His words and works, and in this sense, even though they are a reproduction,—that is, the deeds and words of the Lord passed through their thinking,—yet it was not with the writers of them as it was with the writers of the Epistles. The revelation given in the Gospels is objective as compared with the Epistles. In this sense no new revelation can be expected. If such revelation were given now, it would have to be by the private illumination or inspiration of the individual to whom it is made. But this, in the nature of the case, could be only for him and not authoritatively for others. There would be no witnessing to the objective, as was the case with the Apostles. The only apparent exception to this is in the case of the

Apostle Paul. The glorified Saviour did, indeed, appear to him and make revelations to him, but the Saviour did not make anything known to him which He had not made known before to the other Apostles, and, therefore, even St. Paul did not present anything new. He merely claimed equality with the other Apostles, and for that he had a miraculous call. What was new was not any additional general revelation, but rather his personal call to be the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Swedenborg claimed to have a special illumination to reveal what cannot be otherwise understood from the Scriptures; but although he thus appeals to the Bible itself, yet even his claim cannot be accepted unless he can attest it by a miracle, or something that would give him Apostolic authority. We may repeat: a mere subjective revelation, if such were made to an individual, would be of force, it may be, to himself, but it could not be authenticated to another, or become authority for all men.

On this account, doubtless, the Bible contains not only revelation contemporaneous with the writers, but as it goes back to the beginning of creation, so also it goes forward to the close of human history. There are prophecies as yet unfulfilled. As if to indicate that what is therein recorded covers the whole ground of revelation, and therefore nothing further, as to substance, or objective, is to be looked for, the New Testament ends with the mysterious apocalypse of St. John, and the words it uses in relation to that apocalypse may be applied to the whole Bible, viz., in regard to any one adding to, or taking from, the words of this book. While, then, we can look for no further prophecy, yet we may look for new and higher apprehension of the prophecy there given, and the revelation in the Bible will finally be found to cover the whole field of eschatology, as well as all other portions of revelation.

The Bible is the Word of God. That is the best definition that can be given to it. "My words," says Christ, "are spirit, and they are life." The Word of God is living and energetic, and "sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, even of the joints and marrow, and

is the end of revelation, and His Word is in a sense Himself, and when He gave us His last word, He Himself closed His own revelation until He comes again in glory.

It follows, then, that while the revelation in the Bible is objectively complete, yet subjectively in the mind of the Church the revelation given will reach new and higher stages of apprehension. And this, we know, is sometimes called new revelation, for, it is said, revelation implies a making known, and therefore that which is not known, or apprehended, is not revealed. But we must make a distinction here between a revelation as *subjective* and an *objective* revelation. Christ had fully revealed Himself when He ascended up on high, that is, as an objective revelation, but that revelation was not fully apprehended subjectively by His disciples. In this subjective sense revelation is still progressive, whilst nothing new is added as to the substance of what is already revealed.

An illustration of this difference appears in the revelation in the Gospels as compared with the Epistles. The Epistles are subjective. They unfold the truth contained in the Gospels, but they add nothing to the substance of the Gospels. Weiss maintains, we know, that the Gospels are quite as subjective as the Epistles, and that, therefore, the Epistles are a higher, a more advanced revelation than the Gospels. This is true in a sense, but the Gospels make known to us what came from without, from Christ, His words and works, and in this sense, even though they are a reproduction,—that is, the deeds and words of the Lord passed through their thinking,—yet it was not with the writers of them as it was with the writers of the Epistles. The revelation given in the Gospels is objective as compared with the Epistles. In this sense no new revelation can be expected. If such revelation were given now, it would have to be by the private illumination or inspiration of the individual to whom it is made. But this, in the nature of the case, could be only for him and not authoritatively for others. There would be no witnessing to the objective, as was the case with the Apostles. The only apparent exception to this is in the case of the

Apostle Paul. The glorified Saviour did, indeed, appear to him and make revelations to him, but the Saviour did not make anything known to him which He had not made known before to the other Apostles, and, therefore, even St. Paul did not present anything new. He merely claimed equality with the other Apostles, and for that he had a miraculous call. What was new was not any additional general revelation, but rather his personal call to be the Apostle to the Gentiles.

Swedenborg claimed to have a special illumination to reveal what cannot be otherwise understood from the Scriptures; but although he thus appeals to the Bible itself, yet even his claim cannot be accepted unless he can attest it by a miracle, or something that would give him Apostolic authority. We may repeat: a mere subjective revelation, if such were made to an individual, would be of force, it may be, to himself, but it could not be authenticated to another, or become authority for all men.

On this account, doubtless, the Bible contains not only revelation contemporaneous with the writers, but as it goes back to the beginning of creation, so also it goes forward to the close of human history. There are prophecies as yet unfulfilled. As if to indicate that what is therein recorded covers the whole ground of revelation, and therefore nothing further, as to substance, or objective, is to be looked for, the New Testament ends with the mysterious apocalypse of St. John, and the words it uses in relation to that apocalypse may be applied to the whole Bible, viz., in regard to any one adding to, or taking from, the words of this book. While, then, we can look for no further prophecy, yet we may look for new and higher apprehension of the prophecy there given, and the revelation in the Bible will finally be found to cover the whole field of eschatology, as well as all other portions of revelation.

The Bible is the Word of God. That is the best definition that can be given to it. "My words," says Christ, "are spirit, and they are life." The Word of God is living and energetic, and "sharper than a two-edged sword, piercing to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, even of the joints and marrow, and

is a discerner of the thoughts and intents of the heart." As the Word of God it partakes of the life of the Incarnate Word, and it will stand forever against all its foes, because He from whom it emanates continues to live, the same yesterday, to-day and forever!

THE SUPREME AUTHORITY OF SCRIPTURE.

One of the principles of the Protestant Reformation was that the inspired Scriptures are the only infallible and supreme rule of faith and practice. Because of the adoption of another principle, viz., justification by faith alone, there was some danger already in the time of the Reformation that the first principle here named might be jeopardized, as, for instance, when Luther claimed the right to sit in judgment upon the teaching of some of the inspired books of the Bible. Is there any danger now that the supreme authority of the Bible may be imperiled by the position taken by a number of able thinkers that Christian Consciousness in general is the ultimate test of the interpretation of the Word of God? Let us see. It lies in the very idea of inspiration that the Scriptures were written under a special guidance of the Holy Spirit. We do not pretend to define this inspiration any further here than merely to say it was special. The Apostolate was ordained as the special guide of the Apostolic Church, and their teaching is now contained in, and handed down as, the New Testament. Hence while the Apostolate, as such, ceased to exist after the Apostolic age, its succession as a teaching and guiding authority is now and for all time to be found in the New Testament. To say that Christian Consciousness is an infallible and ultimate test of the interpretation of Scripture is to exalt it to an equality with the inspiration of the Apostles, and this at once would be to deny the special inspiration of the Apostles. It may be said, indeed, that the office of interpretation is not the same as that of original teaching, and therefore the special authority of the Apostles to teach may be granted, whilst the Christian Consciousness may claim an equal infallibility in interpreting their writings. But this is a mistake,

for the moment infallibility in interpreting the Scriptures is attributed to Christian Consciousness, such consciousness is placed on an equality with, if not above, the authority of the Apostles. For this is just the error of the Roman Church on this subject,—that it places the Church above the Scriptures, and makes the Pope their infallible interpreter.

But who is to interpret the Scriptures if not the Church? Certainly the Church is to interpret them; there is no question on that point. The question is whether, at any given time, its interpretation is infallible and therefore final, and thus precludes correction. If it is not final it is not infallible, and there may be a succession of consciousnesses, one correcting another. And that is just what we behold in the *progressive interpretation* of Scripture. The Scripture remains ever one and the same, but its interpretation is constantly advancing more and more to the full measure of the truth.

But whence, then, comes this higher guide in the interpretation of Scripture to lead the Church on to higher apprehension of the truth, or to correct it when it becomes wrong? We answer, it comes from the Scripture itself. It is its own light constantly to guide in its own interpretation. There is a spirit in the Word of God that guides in its interpretation, and just this is the meaning of its *abiding inspiration*. This inspiration, as in the Apostolic age, is ever above the ordinary inspiration of the Church, and this is what we mean when we assert that the Word of God is the only infallible rule of faith. It may seem strange to say that the Scripture is both the rule and the interpreter of the rule, but we assert the same thing when we assert that Christianity is at the same time the highest truth and the highest authentication of the truth. No light outside of Christianity, whether in natural reason or science, can add anything to its own authenticating power. And so we may say that Scripture is both the truth and at the same time the highest authentication of the truth—in other words, its own interpreter. This progressive interpretation comes out in various ways, through different individuals. In the Reformation it was

through the inspired genius of the Reformers over against the Christian Consciousness of the age, but it was the life and spirit of the Word itself that illuminated their pathway in their interpretation of the Scripture.

It may not be easy just at once to grasp this truth, but it is not difficult to see that Christian Consciousness is not infallible or final. It has changed in its interpretation of Scripture, and is constantly changing. To make it the ultimate test, or criterion, is to fall into the Roman error, with the difference that there the Pope is the organ, while here the Church as a whole is the organ.

Of course the Church is always guided into the truth for salvation, but the point here pertains to the authority that is to correct rising error, and this, we maintain, comes from the Word of God, just as the Apostles were qualified to be the special inspired guides in their day.

It might seem pleasing to think that the Church is infallible, but perhaps its fallibility is designed to teach it the infinite value of striving to attain unto the truth. The individual believer is fallible, and it seems to follow from this that the collection of believers may err. But the Scripture is given as the infallible guide so that it may recover itself from error and return to the truth. Hence the great importance of holding to the supreme authority of the Word of God. It has been the safe guide in ages past, and it will guide the people of God safely in all time to come, provided it is held to be the only infallible rule of faith; but overthrow this principle, and Protestantism, like the Roman Church, will be in danger of falling into error, from which another Reformation will be necessary to recover it to the truth. Let the Reformation words be inscribed on her banner: "Verbum Dei in eternum manet."

THE SCRIPTURE AND THE WORD OF GOD.

It ought not to be necessary to say that all Scripture is not the Word of God. It does, indeed, contain the Word of God, but it contains also much that is not the Word of God. The

Book of Job, for instance, whether we regard it as veritable history or poem, teaches a great truth; it contains words from the Lord in regard to the great lesson taught by the life of Job, but it contains also the words of Job's three false comforters, and the words of Job himself, and all four characters failed to grasp the truth in regard to the purpose and meaning of Job's afflictions. It may be said, any intelligent reader will make the distinction between the words of the Lord and those of these four characters in the book; and yet we have heard intelligent ministers preach sermons on the words of those comforters as the inspired word of God. Even Satan's words, "All that a man hath will he give for his life," have been quoted as containing an inspired truth. Much of the Old Testament is composed of the history of a chosen people. That history was under divine direction, and, therefore, reveals the will and purpose of God; and yet, that history also reveals the will and purpose of man as well. Much of it exhibits the weaknesses and failings, the unbelief and disobedience of the chosen people. The concubinage and polygamy of the patriarchs, Jacob's deception of his brother Esau, the slavery permitted by Jewish legislation, we are not to attribute to God, but to man. Even where divine permission was given, it was, in some instances, because of man's weakness, and not because it was the best. Of course God would not give any sanction to what is positively sinful, yet, inasmuch as the Jewish theocracy maintained civil government as well as religious government—a state as well as a church—many things in the civil order had to be tolerated just because of the imperfection and short-comings of the people. Christian nations at the present day maintain large armies and tolerate many things that are not fully in accord with the law of God, because no government in this world can be perfect. Now it is not always an easy matter to separate in the Old Testament between the human and the divine. Certainly such men as Robert Ingersoll, and others like him, show a great deal of obtuseness in attributing in any sense to God the shortcomings and sins of God's people. But Christians

often stumble at such things, particularly in regard to the Jewish government legislation.

The same distinction must be made in the New Testament. True, the record is inspired, yet that record itself informs us of the faults of believers. And we know that even the teaching of a Peter, a Paul, and a John, though free from error, yet cannot in the nature of the case be equal in all respects to the words of our Lord. They exhibit different types of the truth, and no one of these types alone is as full as the teaching of our Lord Himself. This compels us to distinguish between grades of inspiration. We feel at once that the Ten Commandments and the Sermon on the Mount are the Word of God in a sense that cannot be claimed for certain other portions of the Scripture. St. Paul might be mistaken in his chronology, counting 480 years from the promise made to Abraham to the giving of the law, and yet this would not affect the inspiration of his teaching in the doctrines of the Christian faith.

"But where will you draw the line?" it is said, if you begin to make such distinctions. In answer, we reply, we have seen that in some cases such distinction most assuredly must be made, and all that is required is that common sense and intelligence must be used in interpreting the Scripture. In making a revelation God assumes that it is made to intelligent creatures, and, therefore, He does not reveal science, chronology, &c., subjects that man can acquire a knowledge of by his own research, except incidentally, but confines His revelation to supernatural truth which man could not know of himself.

It is the province of the Higher Criticism to determine such questions as the authorship and age of the different portions of Scripture and the relative importance and authority of the different sections, just as the lower criticism has to do mainly with the purification of the text. Great fears were entertained when Bengel and others began the study of the text by comparing the different MSS., and when first the thousands of various readings were brought out, many people feared that it would destroy all proper faith in the Bible as the Word of

God? but we know now that the result has been healthful. This faith has in no wise been lessened, but it has become more intelligent. And so the Higher Criticism must produce equally good results. What though rationalists use it against the Bible? So did Strauss and Bauer try to invalidate the truth of the New Testament, but their attack only served to bring out a better and stronger defence of the gospel of our Lord. Much yet remains to be learned in reference to the Bible, and the more we learn of it the more impregnable will its position become in the faith of believers in Christianity.

THE PROGRESSIVE INTERPRETATION OF SCRIPTURE.

This last remark leads us to present some remarks on the progressive interpretation of Scripture. We have seen that the revelation contained in the Bible covers the whole period reaching from the beginning to the end of the world, the whole of human history. May we not say that its interpretation will cover the same period? There are prophecies that relate to the last things, to the second coming of Christ, the end of the world, the resurrection and the general judgment. Certainly these prophecies will receive a fuller interpretation as these events come to be fulfilled. We stand related to them much as the Jews stood related to the first coming of Christ, and there is some reason to think that our conception of the last things, and our understanding of the prophecies relating to them may be as imperfect as was the understanding of the Jews in regard to Old Testament prophecy relating to Christ.

But in relation to other portions of the Bible also we may believe that very much yet remains but imperfectly understood. We have mastered but a small portion as yet of the mysteries of the natural creation, and are not the mysteries of the new spiritual creation far deeper than those? Truth is life, and life cannot be limited to the apprehension of the logical understanding. Even when it is understood properly in a limited degree, there are still greater depths to be sounded.

Take some of the familiar parables of our Lord relating to

the last things, the parable of the Sheep and the Goats and of the Ten Virgins, have we yet exhausted the meaning of those parables? In the parable of the Sheep and the Goats, it is said, all *nations* shall be gathered before the Judge of quick and dead. The word *ethne*, nations, generally means *gentiles* in the New Testament. Does this parable refer to the judgment of the Gentiles only? or what bearing has it on the judgment of the Gentiles? And the Ten Virgins, does the parable refer to a final and absolute separation, or only to a share in the first resurrection?

Take the words of our Lord, "This is my body," only four words, and has the Christian Church settled on their full meaning? Were they not purposely given in this form in order that progressive interpretations might be put upon them? The Latin Church, we know, gave them a meaning in harmony with their external conception of Christianity as a whole, whilst Protestantism gives them a more spiritual meaning in harmony with its more spiritual conception of Christianity and the Church. Then the two sections of Protestantism, the Lutheran and the Reformed, divided mainly on this issue, and they are not yet united. *Must* not divine revelation be progressively apprehended just because the Church is more and more prepared for deeper apprehensions of the truth?

We believe this idea is too much overlooked by ministers, as is manifest by the tendency with many to seek for topics for sermons in the world, or passages that are unusual and strange, as if the old passages and text have been exhausted, and nothing new can be brought out of them. Even if the meaning, objectively considered, is not new, yet the apprehension of the minister may be new and fresh, and that will communicate itself to the hearers.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

From all that has now been said of the Bible it is evident that the mere literal and grammatical interpretation of Scripture does not exhaust its meaning. This, indeed, is requisite as a

basis, and it is of the utmost importance in this point of view. All the labor expended in criticism of the text and its grammatical interpretation, is necessary, but beyond this the spirit of the interpreter must penetrate deeper than this in getting into the mysteries of revelation. As some men are gifted with natural genius, so some Christian interpreters are gifted with a sanctified genius, or spirit of penetration, in spiritual things. Learning goes with this, but faith is more here than mere learning ; we mean faith as the organ to apprehend supernatural realities. It is not by any externally constituted organ; not by committees, or synods, or popes, that this deeper meaning is reached, but by organs gifted by the Holy Spirit. Such mind will be in sympathy with the general Christian consciousness, and often express such consciousness, but it will often also lead the general mind, and correct the general mind of the church. As in the Reformation certain portions of the Scriptures, such as Romans and Galatians, and certain texts, such as "the just shall live by faith," yielded new truth especially on the doctrine of justification, so we may expect new developments of the church hereafter to be ushered in by new truth from the Word of God. What an incentive we find here for a faithful study of the Scriptures ! Should not Biblical Exegesis and Hermeneutics stand at the front in theological study for theological students and for all ministers of the gospel ?

"YE ARE COMPLETE IN HIM."

BY REV. S. N. CALLENDER, D.D.

THE question is sometimes asked, "Is man in his natural state a son of God?" Exegetes are not agreed in their answers to this question. There are passages of scripture which, in the opinion of some, would require an affirmative answer. Notably, the parable of the Prodigal Son. Whereas, on the other hand, the general tenor of the New Testament would seem to limit the predicate to those who have attained sonship in Christ Jesus. He is spoken of as the Elder Brother of those only who in Him are reconciled to God; and they are sons by adoption. This would seem to involve the fact that as He is the Elder Brother (if in the full sense of the term brother), they must be partakers in common with Him in the life and nature of the Father; and that "adoption," unlike our ordinary legal conception, must involve the idea of birth. So that prior to this new birth the sonship spoken of in scripture as predicable of man in virtue of his creation, must be taken in a modified and lower sense. For if the exegesis of the parable of the Prodigal Son be pushed to the details, and the sonship of the younger be taken in the literal, natural sense, then in its application to spiritual relations, must the being created anew in Christ Jesus be construed as a mere legal, or at best, moral change. The adequacy of this exegesis will depend altogether upon our conception of Christianity as a merely moral, or a spiritual and vital constitution.

But the true solution of our question is not reached by the affirmation of either of the above views, to the negation of the

other. As in the case of almost all contentions, there is truth on both sides. As already said, sonship involves a participation in the life and nature of the Father. St. Paul teaches that in God "we live and move and are." God did not create man, nor for that matter the whole universe, as the potter forms the vessel, which abides thereafter a separate and independent thing. Man as created is not a self-existent being, but exists solely in virtue of the indwelling—the upholding and sustaining power of the life and nature of God. This is equally true of the animal kingdom. But in each order the divine is immanent in the measure of its capacity for its reception. God abides in the order of nature, in the form, as we are accustomed to call it, of impersonal reason. He upholds and sustains it, and its laws and forces are but the manifestations of His will and energy. When we consider the vital realm, even in its lower order—the vegetable—we find the divine indwelling in fuller and larger measure in the form of organic life, and it bespeaks His presence in its bounty, its beauties and its manifold glories. In the animal world we read in clearer lines a higher, fuller presence; in the dawning of rationality and the scintillations of will power. And this in growing measure of fullness, from the border line of the vegetable kingdom on the one hand, to the confines of humanity on the other, each in the order of its physical endowments and its vital capacity. All these in their ascending order, prophesying and adumbrating, that perfected temple for God's intended abode in man, created in full in His own image, as the adequate organ for His manifestation.

In all the orders below man we discern the unconscious, unintelligent and irresponsible instruments of God's pleasure and purpose. They are the passive organs of His revelation. The divine is immanent in them in the form of reason, and as thus in a measure being partakers of the divine, sonship, in a low and qualified sense may be predicated of them. But being destitute of an ethical nature, they are inadequate—have not the capacity for the indwelling of the divine in its fullness. But man as gifted with conscious personality, with a moral no less

than a rational nature, is the living temple adequate to and intended for the indwelling of the divine nature. In common with the lower orders, man is by creation the shrine of deity in the form of reason, and had it pleased God to enter into and become immanent as *the good* in his ethical nature, he would thus have been raised to the realization of his ideal. But this would have been to overwhelm man's self-determining power, and to have ignored his ethical nature—it would have been to make him the passive organ of His pleasure, morally irresponsible like the orders below him. As created, man was the tabernacle of the divine reason, but in the endowment of will, he at first was the unfilled receptacle for the divine as *the good—the righteous—the holy*. This, however, could enter in only in accordance with the law of free will—in answer to its free choice. This effected, then would there come to dwell in man the divine in the fullness of the Godhead. Then would man realize the fullness of the idea of Sonship. This realization would necessarily be progressive. The divine would flow in, in the measure of man's developing capacity, as we conceive the divine to have filled up the measure of the enlarging capacity of Christ's humanity, as He grew in stature and wisdom; until at last in the glorification—in his completed fullness, man would have realized the ideal of sonship.

We conclude from this, that the scriptural idea of sonship can be reached only by a new creation in Christ Jesus. At the same time man is a son of God in virtue of his creation, but this, upon the same plane, but of course of vastly higher degree, with the lower orders of creation. But the idea of sonship, and the extent of the divine immanence in man, is worthy of a most earnest and more extended study.

Christianity is the ideal of humanity. It is the goal towards which humanity is soteriologically advancing, and having reached it in its final glorification, it will realize the idea which was in the mind of God when, in the counsels of eternity, He said, "Let us make man." To arrive at a true conception of humanity, and grasp the comprehension of its contents, no logical

definition or analysis, even though divinely inspired, can meet the necessities of the case, or be, indeed, intelligible, except as it is met and apprehended by a rational human consciousness. In like manner in the case of Christianity, no formulation of its meaning and contents can ever avail for a true knowledge of it, unless there be at hand its actual existence, in the personality of the inquirer. "If any man will do His will, he shall know of the doctrine, whether it be of God." Where there is the divinely-wrought ability to do the work of God, there only is the capacity for knowing and comprehending His revelation.

The existence, then, of the vital principle of Christianity in the soul of man is a condition precedent to his ability to know it and grasp its idea. This principle is lodged in the soul by the regenerative agency of the Holy Ghost. But this, in the soul as corrupted by sin. In this disorganized bosom it exists at first as the mustard seed and as leaven, awaiting on the one hand its own proper enlargement, and on the other the transformation of the whole inner man into its own image. This, as is well understood, is what is theologically denominated sanctification, and involves a process which can reach its completion only in final glorification. Meanwhile the soul in the midst of spiritual conflict, and only gradually emerging from the darkness of ignorance, is incapable of reaching a full and clear consciousness of the divine efficiency working within. Its apprehension of it at any stage of the development can be but partial, and can be in full measure only when the process itself is completed. It is the office of the inspired word to shine into the soul through the beclouded avenue of faith, and thus open the way for an enlarged apprehension of the divine power working within. But what is this inspired word—what but the verbal delineation and recorded description of the living word? It is then the living word, shining through the written word which enters as light into the regenerate soul and awakens it to a clearer and growing consciousness of the indwelling truth. In the incarnate Word we have the living manifestation of Christianity. In Jesus Christ we have the actualization of all that

is contained in it, in living concrete form, and only as we are in vital union with Him can we ever reach its true idea. As a study, then, if we would know the significance and contents of Christianity we must turn to Him; and in attaining to which knowledge, we reach the measure, the constitution and the contents of *humanity*, "for we are complete in Him." *

With the postulation of these premises we proceed to the consideration of the question, What is involved in the Apostle Paul's idea of our completion in Christ Jesus? Did he mean to say that, in His equipment for and fulfillment of His office as Redeemer, Christ had made all needful provision for the salvation of man, and thus would discourage recourse to any other agency? or was there not present to his mind the conception of a constitutional defect in man—a deficiency which vitiated his nature and disqualified him for his intended destiny? And that in Christ this deficiency was provided for and supplied, and thus completed the true idea of humanity? Not that this latter conception excluded the former, but that both existed in his thought in full harmony.

It is not unusual to view Christianity under a two-fold aspect—as *completive* and *redemptive*—as presenting complementary sides of the same glorious truth. The latter, which is pre-eminently Pauline, considers man as a sinner, and is concerned primarily with the provision made in Christ Jesus for his deliverance from the power of sin and death. The former is Johannean, and bestows its thought principally upon man in his constitutional being and relations.

Protestantism, as Pauline in its theology, has from the beginning contemplated the redemptive side of Christianity—as the power of God for the salvation of the soul. It regards man as helplessly under the power of sin, and its primary question ever has been, what are the instrumentalities of grace for his deliverance from this bondage. Finding these to be of purely divine origin, its theology has unduly emphasized the divine factor at the expense of the human. It accepted the traditional anthro-

* Col. 2: 10.

pology and doctrine of sin, which were propounded by the Alexandrian theology, which held that the image of God in which man was created, involved the completion of his being, and that sin was simply a weakening of his powers, to be overcome by the agency of an outward divine educational help; and that room was made for this help by the interposition of the incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ, as a satisfaction for the guilt of sin. Although the Reformers theoretically discarded this Pelagian view, and held that the wages of sin was death, yet in consequence of the one-sided emphasis placed by modern theology upon the divine means of salvation, it practically holds that man is constitutionally whole, requiring only a deliverance from the *effects* of sin, leaving him as redeemed upon precisely the same plane of his natural being that he was before. This reduces sin to a legal complication, requiring only a legal adjustment for its remedy. Hence arose the prevailing views, that there can be no forgiveness of sin without a legal satisfaction, and that this satisfaction made by the Saviour, is accounted to the credit of the repentant sinner; and that from thenceforth he is enabled by the aid of an *influence* wrought by the Holy Spirit, to rely by faith upon Christ's merits and conform his life to His precepts.

This view, it will be readily perceived, degrades the incarnation to the condition of an expedient, devised to meet the necessities of an emergency which arose in the fact of sin. In other words, had not man sinned, there would have been no incarnation, its occasion being simply to provide for a suffering atonement. This view also in reality denies the vital element in the mystical union, as also the immanence of the divine in the human. Then, while having much to say of the intimacy of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the soul of the believer, yet making it, as it does, *an influence* merely, wrought by even a tactful closeness of relation, withal in reality an objective relation, it falls into the general category of Deism. Man is saved by forces acting upon him from without, and thus redeemed, he is completed without the increment to his nature of any positive element

is contained in it, in living concrete form, and only as we are in vital union with Him can we ever reach its true idea. As a study, then, if we would know the significance and contents of Christianity we must turn to Him; and in attaining to which knowledge, we reach the measure, the constitution and the contents of *humanity*, "for we are complete in Him." *

With the postulation of these premises we proceed to the consideration of the question, What is involved in the Apostle Paul's idea of our completion in Christ Jesus? Did he mean to say that, in His equipment for and fulfillment of His office as Redeemer, Christ had made all needful provision for the salvation of man, and thus would discourage recourse to any other agency? or was there not present to his mind the conception of a constitutional defect in man—a deficiency which vitiated his nature and disqualified him for his intended destiny? And that in Christ this deficiency was provided for and supplied, and thus completed the true idea of humanity? Not that this latter conception excluded the former, but that both existed in his thought in full harmony.

It is not unusual to view Christianity under a two-fold aspect—as *completive* and *redemptive*—as presenting complementary sides of the same glorious truth. The latter, which is pre-eminently Pauline, considers man as a sinner, and is concerned primarily with the provision made in Christ Jesus for his deliverance from the power of sin and death. The former is Johannine, and bestows its thought principally upon man in his constitutional being and relations.

Protestantism, as Pauline in its theology, has from the beginning contemplated the redemptive side of Christianity—as the power of God for the salvation of the soul. It regards man as helplessly under the power of sin, and its primary question ever has been, what are the instrumentalities of grace for his deliverance from this bondage. Finding these to be of purely divine origin, its theology has unduly emphasized the divine factor at the expense of the human. It accepted the traditional anthro-

* Col. 2: 10.

pology and doctrine of sin, which were propounded by the Alexandrian theology, which held that the image of God in which man was created, involved the completion of his being, and that sin was simply a weakening of his powers, to be overcome by the agency of an outward divine educational help; and that room was made for this help by the interposition of the incarnation, sufferings and death of Christ, as a satisfaction for the guilt of sin. Although the Reformers theoretically discarded this Pelagian view, and held that the wages of sin was death, yet in consequence of the one-sided emphasis placed by modern theology upon the divine means of salvation, it practically holds that man is constitutionally whole, requiring only a deliverance from the *effects* of sin, leaving him as redeemed upon precisely the same plane of his natural being that he was before. This reduces sin to a legal complication, requiring only a legal adjustment for its remedy. Hence arose the prevailing views, that there can be no forgiveness of sin without a legal satisfaction, and that this satisfaction made by the Saviour, is accounted to the credit of the repentant sinner; and that from thenceforth he is enabled by the aid of an *influence* wrought by the Holy Spirit, to rely by faith upon Christ's merits and conform his life to His precepts.

This view, it will be readily perceived, degrades the incarnation to the condition of an expedient, devised to meet the necessities of an emergency which arose in the fact of sin. In other words, had not man sinned, there would have been no incarnation, its occasion being simply to provide for a suffering atonement. This view also in reality denies the vital element in the mystical union, as also the immanence of the divine in the human. Then, while having much to say of the intimacy of the relation of the Holy Spirit to the soul of the believer, yet making it, as it does, *an influence* merely, wrought by even a factual closeness of relation, withal in reality an objective relation, it falls into the general category of Deism. Man is saved by forces acting upon him from without, and thus redeemed, he is completed without the increment to his nature of any positive element

which he did not possess while in a state of sin. So that the incarnation, sufferings, death, resurrection and ascension, bringing no vital addition to humanity, they only remove hindrances and disabilities out of the way. Was this all that was in the Apostle's mind when in the language of the text he declared, "Ye are complete in him?"

Modern theological thought is coming to be more and more deeply impressed with the inadequacy of this view. It is protesting against it as degrading our Lord Jesus Christ to the status of a means to an end; and it is insisting that He is the Omega no less than the Alpha in the creation of God. It is felt that a one-sided emphasis has been placed upon the redemptive side of Christianity, and thought is now being turned to the complementary, the compleptive side. In doing this, we must seek to contemplate Christ, as also man, from a Johannine point of view. That is, what they are in themselves and in their constitutional relations, the one to the other. As St. John contemplates the Logos in His relations to the Godhead and to man, anterior to the fact of sin, so we must seek to consider man in his constitution and relations to God, as he came forth from the creative hand.

God created man pure and good, and in His own image. This last, that is the divine image, we take it, has primary reference to man's spiritual nature as a personality. It implies, however, at the same time, that there was in his whole constitution a perfect adaptation and vital affinity in all the powers and organs of his being for the office to which he was ordained, as the shrine and organ for the indwelling and manifestation of the divine essence and glory. Its normal activity depended upon the immanence of the divine essence. All its parts and functional activities were shaped with reference to this end, and he may be said to have been, *potentially*, a completed being. But potentiality implies development, growth; and this implies in turn the necessity of causal conditions. Moreover, these conditions must be of such nature of adaptability and homogeneity as to enter into organic union with the life. Mere outward contact

will not meet the necessities of the case. This is true in case of man's physical and intellectual life, it is pre-eminently true of his spiritual life. Man then in his creation was endowed with all things necessary for the realization of the teleology of his being, *but* all this, conditioned by his voluntary reception of those things which needs must enter into his constitution as conditions, in order to realize his idea as a completed organism. In so far, Adam was complete when he became a living soul.

In his creation, Adam's will was void of contents. Its powers of free self-determination were at hand, and it remained to his will to choose its love—its rule of action—its contents. The constitution of his being presupposed, and its normal action demanded a definite order of contents as the law of its action, just as the stomach constitutionally demands a congenial and correlative content. He had the ethical power to elect that which would have been to him the good, and to reject the bad. Had he chosen the good, his being would have been perfected—complete; but choosing the bad, his whole being became disorganized, and the end of his being was, unless redeemed, defeated. This good, which the nature of his will demanded, and which he ought, in truth to himself, have chosen, was not simply an ethico-intellectual code for his actions, but a homogeneous entity, which as his love should enter into union with his life as its nourishing, energizing force, and as thus received become the spring and support of his being. This good was the only good—it was God. Only thus could man attain his ideal—only thus become complete.

When man failed to choose the good, lacking the necessary condition of his normal well-being, he fell under the power of death. That is, he was helplessly cut off from the realization of his higher being. Having rejected the only means by which his life could be perfected and confirmed, there was left him no means of self-recovery. No activity of his remaining powers could ever compensate for this loss. No latent principle within him could ever develop into a cure. The principle of the divine life had been rejected, and, as a consequence, the fact of eternal

life, and he was dead. The error of the old Greek theology, in likening sin to a disease, which the natural life, aided by educational medicaments, might overcome, was, that it mistook the indwelling of the divine reason, which is immanent in all created existences, be they good or be they bad, for that divine indwelling which enters through man's ethical nature, and which alone is unto completed being and everlasting life. Sin is a disease, an abnormality, a disorganization, but, in the absence of an underlying vital principle, it is none other than death and hell commenced here on earth.

Sin, then, is something more than a disease, with the possibility of recovery by the force of a vitality lying back of it—than a mere weakening of man's moral and spiritual powers—than an ignorance simply, to be overcome by education. It is all these, *but* these as the *results* of a want of that vital union with the divine nature which is to come to man through the avenue of the will, and which alone is the power of an endless life. There is vastly more Pelagianism and, indeed, refined Deism in our popular theology than many ministers of the Gospel are aware of, in consequence of their failure to trace to their logical results views which perhaps they themselves proclaim from the pulpit. It is these low conceptions of sin, and the consequent defective notions of the necessary remedial agencies, that cause the Church to be looked upon as a mere human association—that leave the sacraments to be invested with their efficacy by the subjective experiences of the recipients—that see no material difference between regeneration and conversion, and that rely upon sensational methods, rather than upon the divinely-appointed ordinances of grace, to win souls to Christ. Let it once come to be well understood that sin means *death*, and that regeneration means a *new creation* in Christ Jesus, and the means of grace appointed by Him will no longer be held as of secondary importance as compared with methods of human device.

Christ announced the supreme purpose of His mission into this world when He declared, "I am come that ye might have life." This was the capital desideratum under which man la-

bored, as over against his estate of death. What man needed was not merely the negative benefit of deliverance from the penalty of sin, but the positive good of elevation to his right organic relations to God. And thus the realization of the ideal of his being, to which he had never as yet attained. To this end did Christ enter into union with our fallen humanity and completed it. His human nature was the organ for this completion. As its capacity for reception developed and enlarged, did the divine essence enter into it in organic vital union, and actualized the idea which existed in the mind and will of the Creator. This union of the divine and human would have taken place had not man fallen into sin. It must have taken place. But whether in the precise form in which it transpired, we do not know. Man was created as the organ for the manifestation of the divine. The structure of his being presupposed it, and anything short of the designed indwelling was to leave it unperfect—incomplete. We may suppose that the Son of Man came, to at least the temporal culmination and corresponding consciousness of this union with the fullness of the Godhead, upon the occasion of His baptism, when the Spirit of God descended upon and abode—remaining on Him. We are not to suppose that that was designed as a mere heavenly testimonial to assure the faith of the Baptist, but that the Divine Spirit abode with Him in such sense that St. Luke was warranted in speaking of Him as "being full of the Holy Ghost," and to call forth the voice "from heaven, which said, Thou art my beloved Son; in thee I am well pleased"—thus indicating a consummation of union with the Father, which did not in like measure of fullness exist before. So that He could in unfaltering phrase declare, "I am in the Father and the Father in me."

In the incarnation we have the prototype of the union with the divine nature to which the believer must attain. Not that every individual will be an incarnation in the same measure that Christ was; for in Him dwelt not only the fullness of the Godhead, but equally the fullness of humanity, generically, and the believer stands related to Him as the branch does to the vine.

But that, by virtue of the new birth and the mystical union, we become in Him united with the Godhead, so as that, like unto Him, each one in his own measure is in the Father and the Father in him. This not only frees the child of God from the penal consequences of sin, but raises him out of and above the fact and estate of sin itself. Christ came not only to save the soul of man from perdition, but to take away the sin of the world. The deliverance from death and hell is a consequence, a necessary consequence indeed, but not the primary factor in redemption. This factor is involved in the union of the soul with God, which is effected by our mystical union with Christ. The incarnation, then, is the point of contact—of union of the divine nature and humanity. Its actualization in the person of Christ is the basal principle—the fountal source of life and salvation to the world. From thence must go forth every saving and redeeming efficacy, and to this, as to a common centre, must every spiritual activity turn, as to its producing cause.

From this general view of the subject, the question may arise, what is the significance, and wherein holds the necessity of the death and sufferings of Christ? Why might not the incarnation have availed at once and immediately for the completed salvation of man? A little careful thought will make it apparent, that this is to ask in other words that other question, Why did not God at once bring to an end the whole order of earthly existence and human history? Why did not God make perfect sanctification to synchronize with regeneration? We are not authorized to say that He could not have done so. For we are told that when the end does come, the believers then upon the earth will "be changed in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye." But when Christ became incarnate, God's creative purpose was not yet accomplished—His ordained order of human history had not yet reached its goal. If then this history and this purpose were to move forward to the accomplishment of their infinitely wise design, it must be along the lines and in accordance with the laws both physical and ethical which their constitution and adaptations demanded. If man was to

live in this world as man, he must do so in obedience to and in accordance with the laws inwrought in his nature. The humanity which was taken into union with the Divine nature of Christ was not a humanity *de novo*, but the humanity of Adam, broken and disorganized by sin. Now as disorganization and abnormal action in case of all sentient existences involves pain and suffering, and in case of moral creatures, penalty, this disorganized humanity carried in itself the necessity of suffering, and this could be surmounted only as its cause was exhausted and overcome. The divine entered into the human as leaven, to gradually permeate it and transform it into its own image. Meanwhile the human in process of being transformed, experiences the bitter effects of its broken law. Thus was it that Christ must needs suffer—He must be made “perfect through suffering.” The disorganization and imperfection of the humanity He assumed, entailed it upon Him. And He must overcome this imperfection, and at the same time vindicate the righteousness and justice of law whose violation inflicted the suffering, by exhausting the penalty in the way of endurance.

This thought may be made clearer by a simple illustration, even though it be but partial. While we do not accept the notion of the Greek theologians, that sin is but a disease, we conceive that the *effects of sin* may be compared to the effects of a disease. In this view we employ sickness and its attendant weakness and suffering as an illustration. Take the case of typhoid fever, where its victim has gone down well nigh to the confines of the spirit world. At this point we will imagine an arrest of the disease. The vital principle within may now again assert itself. But what is his condition? Free indeed from positive disease, and the vital principle delivered from the consuming fires of fever, but his whole system is weakened and disorganized and his powers abnormal in their action. There opens before him a tedious, painful pathway of convalescence. He must pass through all the pains, privations and sufferings entailed upon him as the effects of the vanquished disease. And only after he has surmounted and exhausted them all, does he

reach the goal of restored health and strength. Verily is he made perfect through suffering.

Thus did the Saviour pass through all the painful effects and penalties entailed upon humanity by sin. And only after He had drunk the cup to its bitterest dregs, and endured and exhausted its last and highest penalty, did He reach the goal of perfection. Then from the eminence of His victory over death and the grave, did He proclaim His kingdom in these tremendous words, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth, go ye therefore and disciple all nations."

It requires no labored thought from this point of view, to see that the completion of our nature as effected in the person of Christ, cannot be wrought out upon the plane of our natural Adamic life. In this estate man is dead to the higher divine life. And only as this life reaches down from above and enters into and apprehends our natural life, can it be raised to its union with God. "And no man hath ascended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of man which is in heaven." (St. John 3: 18.) The natural man has no power to go out of himself and apprehend and appropriate the divine to his spiritual completion. The power of faith, the power to discern the supernatural, is latent as a faculty of the human soul. Its function is that of receptivity rather than that of positive apprehension. In other words, faith is the organ, the spiritual sense, the avenue through which the divine brought to it from above by the Holy Spirit, enters into the soul and takes up its abode. This susceptibility weakened, enfeebled and restrained as a mere potentiality by sin, is quickened and energized by the preached gospel. "Faith cometh by hearing." With faith thus energized into receptive activity, the soul is in the necessary attitude for the reception of the divine-human life of Christ, which by the regenerative energy of the Holy Ghost, is brought to and through this receptive avenue, enters into the will. It takes up its abode, not as a germ to develop its latent potentialities, but like leaven, which through the native affinities and aptitudes of man's spiritual

nature, enters into and permeates the whole life. This inflow in the process of sanctification is conditioned by the growth and development of faith, the enlargement of man's receptive capacities. Hence the necessity on one hand of the continued ministry of the preached word, to increase the growth in faith, and on the other, the no less continued ministry of the body and blood of Christ, as the sacramental means for the continuous inflow of the divine-human life. The soul, by this we mean man's whole inner life, in the article of the new creation or regeneration, is passive. The divine enters through the avenue of quickened faith, and once lodged within, the will, not faith, through the functions of its native affinities and aptitudes co-operates with the leavening power of the divine life, to the progressive movement of sanctification. Just as truth entering the reason through the avenues of the senses, is apprehended by the will, which through the functions of the rational powers, facilitates its apprehension and appropriation in the form of conscious knowledge. Thus does the believer on the one hand grow in faith, and on the other, in grace and the conscious knowledge of everlasting life.

Thus is it that we are complete in Jesus Christ, who is the head of all principality and power, and in whom also "are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge." He is the fountain of life, and only as we are mystically and vitally united with Him, can we have life; and only as we are enabled by spiritual illumination to rationally discern the contents of His person, can we attain to true wisdom and knowledge—a true and ultimately infallible theology.

III.

THE INSPIRATION OF THE BIBLE.*

BY REV. W. RUPP, D.D.

THE idea of inspiration, in the general signification of a divine influence upon human knowledge, is not peculiar to Christianity. Other religions make the same claim for their sacred books which Christianity makes for the Bible. The Vedas, among the Hindus, and the Zendavesta, among the Persians, were believed to have had their origin in some supernatural influence upon the minds of their authors, and to possess the quality of inspiration. Among the Greeks and Romans, all striking, or peculiar mental phenomena, were referred to the immediate influence of some divinity. The poet, the orator, the philosopher, as well as the man of action, were believed to be filled with the spirit of some god. "Men do not produce beautiful poems," says Plato, "by rules of art ($\tauέχνη$), but by being full of deity, ($ὑθεοι δύτες$) and possessed." Cicero, in the oration for Archias, states that it was the opinion of the greatest and most learned men that "the poet derives his power from nature, and is filled by the breath of a divine spirit;" and elsewhere he observes that "no man was ever great without some divine afflatus."

The same general idea prevailed also among the Jews, as well as among other Semitic nations. By these the wisdom of the lawgiver, the skill of the architect, the eloquence of the

* This paper was read, substantially as here published, with the exception of the notes, at the Conference of Reformed ministers of Western Pennsylvania, at Butler, Pa., the last week of August, 1891. It is published in this Review at the request of the Conference.

poet, as well as the prescience of the prophet, were all regarded as the direct gift of Jehovah. Bezaleel and Hiram, Joshua and Solomon, as well as Moses and Isaiah, were believed to have been filled with wisdom, and prepared for their particular callings by the Spirit of God. Indeed, all knowledge was supposed to have its origin in some divine impression or influence upon the human mind, while the mind itself was regarded as a special divine gift. "There is a spirit in man," it was said, "and the breath of the Almighty giveth them understanding."

This general quality of inspiration was, of course, ascribed to the writers of the sacred books, at the time when those books were written; but there is no evidence that anything more than this was ascribed to them. There is no trace in the Old Testament that the writers thereof either believed themselves, or were believed by their contemporaries, to be inspired in any other sense than that in which all good and pious men were believed to be inspired. When David said, "The Spirit of the Lord spake by me, and His word was upon my tongue," he claimed no more than might have been claimed for any other great and good Israelite whose words were never committed to writing.

In post-canonical Judaism the idea of the inspiration of the writers of the Old Testament was much intensified, and their compositions came to be regarded as *sacred Scriptures*, an expression that occurs for the first time in 1 Mac. xii. 9. But even then no specific difference was generally made between the inspiration of those writers and that which was supposed to be at least possible in the case of common believers. Philo, whose thinking was influenced largely by Greek ideas, did more than any other writer to formulate the doctrine of inspiration which the Christian Church afterwards received from the Synagogue. He appropriated the Greek conception of a divine phrenzy (*μανία*) and used it as an explanation of the psychological condition of an inspired person, and held that the divine light rises in a man in proportion as that of his own consciousness goes down. And yet, that even he did not assume any

specific difference between the inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture and that of other highly endowed persons, is plain from the fact that he does not hesitate at times to claim inspiration even for himself. Philo, moreover, while maintaining that every word in Scripture is inspired, yet admitted that there are degrees of inspiration, and that all the books of Scripture are not alike in this respect. Josephus, also, while greatly magnifying the Jewish Scriptures as certain sources of divine information, yet makes a distinction between the writings of the prophets who have given "the original and earliest accounts of things as they learned them from God Himself by inspiration," and the books of other sacred writers, who have, in a distinct manner, related what happened in their own times.

The writers of the New Testament, in the same manner as Philo and Josephus, treat the Old Testament with the highest veneration as Sacred Scripture, pervaded by the breath of the Divine Spirit, and therefore profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, and for instruction in righteousness. While, however, they had these exalted ideas of the Scriptures of the Old Testament, there is no direct evidence that they regarded their own writings in the same sacred character. Though the Church afterwards, under the guidance of an unerring divine instinct, placed these writings in the same class with those of the Old Testament, their authors themselves, so far as any direct evidence appears, had no such anticipation. They did not regard themselves as especially commissioned and qualified to give to the church an infallible code of doctrines and precepts, that should serve as an inviolable measure of faith and practice for all time. Their writing was something incidental only to their office of evangelists and preachers of the Gospel to their own contemporaries. Its motive and purpose were determined by the existing circumstances of the time. When they wrote the apostles did not claim to be in any special sense instruments of the Holy Spirit for communicating to the world new truths with an authority entirely different from that which belonged to their ordinary teaching. Though they believed themselves

to be inspired, that is, filled with the Spirit of Christ, both when they wrote and when they spoke, they did not claim this inspiration to be a special source of knowledge, or a condition of infallibility in respect of their writings.

The writers of the New Testament sometimes claim that they have received certain truths by special acts of divine revelation; as St. Paul, for example, declares that he received from the Lord the account of the institution of the eucharist; and, indeed, they assume that the whole body of truth which they have to communicate, rests ultimately upon the self-revelation of God in Christ through the Spirit. The Gospel is not an invention; it has not been reasoned out of innate ideas, or out of premises naturally inherent in the human mind; it is a revelation. But the writers of the New Testament never identify this revelation with inspiration. And they never claim to have come into possession of the facts of revelation in any other than the common psychological way, which, however, must not be restricted to the operation of the five senses; nor do they claim that, in committing these facts to writing, they are governed by any other than the ordinary psychological laws, or guided by any other than the ordinary rules of literary composition.

St. Luke says distinctly that in gathering the material for his Gospel, he followed the common historical method of examining eye-witnesses and ear-witnesses of the facts which he was about to record. These facts were not made known to him supernaturally. Similarly St. John tells us that he has obtained the knowledge of the things which he is going to write about in the ordinary psychological manner. "That which we have seen with our eyes," he says, "that which we beheld, and our hands handled concerning the word of life . . . that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you." There is no intimation here, or anywhere else in the New Testament, that the apostles, when writing their books, were communicating facts or truths that were put into their minds in contravention of those common psychological laws which govern the acquisition of all knowledge. Even when they received supernatural im-

pressions or communications in a state of trance or vision, like the author of the *Apocalypse*, or St. Paul, when caught up into Paradise, they were afterwards obliged to reproduce and elaborate these impressions in their ordinary consciousness, and by means of their ordinary mental faculties, before they were able to commit them to writing; a thing which St. Paul, at least in the case referred to, was unable to do, so that he was obliged to be content with simply saying that he heard unspeakable things which it is impossible (*δεῖσθαι*) for a man to utter.

The inspiration of the writers of Holy Scripture, then, did not consist in any communication to them of knowledge in a miraculous way, nor in any miraculous direction of them during the work of literary composition. As a preliminary positive definition, we here lay down the proposition, that the inspiration of the sacred writers consisted in such a spiritual quickening of their souls, through immediate contact with the Spirit of truth in consciousness, as to enable them to form true and adequate conceptions of the things revealed, and therefore also to communicate the same to others in a true and adequate form; this influence of the Spirit being exercised, not in contravention of the general psychological laws which govern all mental operations, but in entire conformity therewith; and being dependent always upon the historical revelation of God in Christ. The Spirit speaks not of Himself, but He takes of the things of Christ and shows them to the disciples; and it is only in this way that He leads them into all truth. And the quality which belongs to the knowledge of the original recipients of the revelation in virtue of this influence of the Spirit of revelation upon their souls, belongs also to the *Bible*, which becomes thus the original, true, and sufficient record of revelation.

We have, then, these three conceptions to deal with in the further discussion of our subject, namely, *revelation*, the *Bible*, and *inspiration*. In this discussion, however, we can do but little more, within the limits of this paper, than simply present propositions without argument, relying upon the logical consis-

tency of statement and upon the reasonableness and self-consistency of the theory as a whole for its convincing force.

Revelation is the objective self-manifestation of God in human life and history ; the Bible is the original record of that revelation ; and inspiration is that quality of the Bible which makes it to be a *true, living, and sufficient record* of the divine revelation.

There is a three-fold manifestation of God, namely, a manifestation in *nature*, in *human consciousness*, and in *history*. The outward world of nature contains a manifestation of God, which discloses especially His power, His wisdom, and His goodness. The best interpreter of this manifestation is the *poet*. The inward nature of man also contains a manifestation of God. The necessary laws of reason and conscience give us the ideas of absolute existence and of absolute goodness. To interpret this inward manifestation of God is the task of the *philosopher*. But these ideas of absolute existence and of absolute goodness would be mere empty conceptions, or forms of thought, if God did not also manifest Himself directly in human consciousness and experience. As by means of our sensuous nature we have direct intuitions of the outer world, so through our spiritual nature we have direct intuitions of God and of Divine things ; and these intuitions give to our rational conceptions of God their contents, and impart to the so-called religions of nature their spiritual force and vitality, making them to be something more than mere systems of empty idolatry. To interpret this manifestation of God in consciousness is the special calling of the *theosophist* or *mystic*.

But God reveals Himself especially in history, which, of course, does not exclude but include all the other forms of divine self-manifestation ; and this is the revelation with which we are now particularly concerned. The organ of this revelation is the *prophet*, in the most general sense of the word as denoting *one who speaks for God*. The other forms of divine revelation are incidentally recognized in the Bible, but of this the Bible is the express and formal record.

The historical self-manifestation of God in human life, as it is portrayed in Sacred Scripture, forms an organic process, which, while starting at the very commencement of human development and embracing the whole race of man in its ultimate scope, had its main current, for ages, in the life and history of a single people, and there concentrated itself at last, and came to its absolute completion, in the person and life of a single individual, who is Himself God manifest in the flesh—the life and light of the world. In the history of Israel God manifested Himself from time to time by means of outward occurrences and inward impressions, which served to disclose His nature, His mind and character, and His purposes in regard to man, so far as men were then capable of receiving such disclosure. The special organs and interpreters of this revelation were the prophets. “God spake, in times past, unto the fathers in the prophets.” It was in this way that Israel, which started at first from the common level of Semitic heathenism, came at last to have conceptions of God which, in respect both of intellectual and ethical purity, so far surpassed those of its neighbors.

The fact should be emphasized here and steadily borne in mind, that the special content of divine revelation is *God Himself*. What God reveals is Himself, His nature, His mind, His character, His thoughts and purposes. The object of divine revelation is not to make known things pertaining to history or science, which man is capable of finding out by the exercise of his own faculties. When physical and historical conceptions are intertwined with divine facts in the record of revelation; as is the case, for example, in the accounts of the creation, of the flood, of the dispersion of mankind, and of the ancient Oriental empires—these conceptions belong not to the *essence*, but merely to the *setting* of the revelation. The same is true of philosophical and psychological conceptions; so that a Biblical psychology, for example, must be as much of a mistake as a Biblical geology or physiology would be. The purely historical, scientific, or philosophical conceptions that are met with in the Bible, are simply

the conceptions that were generally current in the time of its authors, and can therefore not lay claim to the authority of divine revelation. The essence of divine revelation, for the preservation and communication of which the Bible exists, is the nature, the mind, and the character of God. Everything else in the record is incidental or inferential.

And this self-revelation of God, which as a connected series of divine operations runs through the whole history of Israel, came to its culmination at last in the Christ, in whom the entire divine mind, the Divine Logos or Reason itself, is visibly expressed in human nature and life. "The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us, and we beheld His glory, a glory as of the only begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth." Christ Himself says to His disciples: "He that hath seen me hath seen the Father . . . I am in the Father, and the Father in me. The words that I say unto you I speak not from myself: but the Father abiding in me doeth His works." God who formerly spake unto the fathers in the prophets, by divers portions and in divers manners, has now spoken once for all in His Son, in whom He has uttered the whole plenitude of His being. In the person, the life, the words and works of Christ, in His suffering and death, in His resurrection and glorification, and in His mediatorial reign and activity in the Church by the Spirit, there is an absolute disclosure of the nature, the mind, and the character of God. And this objective disclosure of the being and mind of God, together with the subjective impression produced by this disclosure through mediation of the Spirit in the minds of men, is what we call *divine revelation*.

The idea of revelation implies that the divine fact or truth disclosed be adequately apprehended and understood. A revelation that should contradict the laws of human reason, or that should essentially transcend its capacity, would be no revelation at all. The idea of revelation further implies that by the apprehension of it a subjective mental or emotional state be produced in the soul corresponding to the character of the objective divine truth; in like manner, for example, that a beau-

tiful object or scene in nature, when properly apprehended, awakens peculiar emotions and puts the mind into a peculiar aesthetic mood. Now, according to the teaching of the New Testament, the medium through which the divine revelation makes its peculiar impression upon the soul, and through which its full force and meaning are borne in upon the percipient mind, is the Holy Spirit, who, acting as the Spirit of Christ, takes of the things of Christ and shows them unto us. As the poet in his communion with nature is in contact, not merely with dead or inert forms of matter, but with the living mind that is in nature, and that so stirs and quickens his imagination as to enable him to gain a *real* and not merely *notional* apprehension of its truth; so the human organ of divine revelation is in contact, not merely with the outward form of a divine deed or word, but with the divine mind or Spirit itself, which so impresses the human spirit as to produce a *real* and *vital* apprehension of the truth to be communicated. And the peculiar mental condition, the emotional movement or thrill, produced by this spiritual impression, is the *state of inspiration*, which is thus a necessary subjective complement of the objective divine operation in the process of revelation.

And, now, of this process of revelation and of its ultimate result in the establishment of the kingdom of God the Bible is the original and permanent record in human language. When we say in *human language*, the expression, though seemingly trite, implies that the Bible is really a human book, and that in its composition and structure it really conforms to the laws of human thought and speech. It is the essential part of the literature of the people of revelation, providentially originated and preserved, no doubt, yet partaking of the common characteristics of all national literatures. And yet the Bible is also a peculiar book, differing from other books as much as its substantial contents differ from those of other books. This peculiarity may be said to consist in the breath of the Divine Spirit—the Spirit of revelation—breathing from its contents upon the spirit of the devout reader, and bringing the latter into immedi-

ate contact with the substance of the divine revelation. And this peculiarity we denote by the term *inspiration*.

It is often said that the Bible was given by *inspiration*, meaning that its contents were directly communicated, by the Holy Spirit, to the minds of the sacred writers, either in the form of words, or in the form of bare ideas to be clothed in words by the writers themselves; somewhat after the manner in which a teacher may dictate sentences to a pupil. This expression, though countenanced by the translation, in the Common Version, of 2 Tim. 3: 16, is nevertheless erroneous and misleading. Instead of saying that the Bible was given by inspiration, we should rather say that, having been written by inspired men, it is itself inspired, the inspiration inhering in it as an essential and permanent quality. The predicate θεόπνευστος, which the apostle applies to the whole Scripture, does not relate merely to the manner in which this Scripture originated, but asserts the fact that it is fragrant always with the breath of God which is in it, and which makes it to be profitable for edification in all the various conditions of the religious life.*

The inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture, in the view here presented, consisted in a peculiar quickening and exaltation of mind produced by immediate contact with the Spirit of truth; and this quality or state of mind, communicated to the Bible, imparts to it a form or character which makes it to be an appropriate medium for direct communication with the same Spirit on the part of the reader. As an inspired book the Bible thus serves the purpose of putting the sympathetic reader virtually into the same relation to the objective divine

* Grammatically we regard θεόπνευστος, in the passage referred to above, as a *predicate*, co-ordinate with δημιουρος. To treat it as an *attributive* directly connected with the subject γραψη, and to insert a copula between it and και, we hold, would be grammatical violence. We believe that the proper word to be supplied is the participle οντα, which should be inserted after γραψη. Then the sentence will read: "All Scripture being divinely inspired, and profitable for teaching," &c. For similar constructions see 1 Tim. 1: 16; 2: 3; 4: 9, and Tit. 3: 8, 9. Of course the Scripture referred to in this passage is that of the Old Testament.

truth, or revelation, in which the writers themselves stood, and of enabling him to form the same religious ideas and sentiments which filled the souls of those writers while they were engaged in the work of composition. The inspiration of the Bible, accordingly, does not make it a dead code of doctrines and precepts for the legal regulation of faith and practice by the Church, but a book of lively oracles for the quickening of religious life in the soul of the reader. And this is its immediate and primary object, while its relation to doctrine is but mediate and secondary.*

The inspiration of the Bible is thus akin to what may be called artistic genius, or genial inspiration in the sphere of art. This comparison is suggested by the fact that the ancients, both Greeks and Hebrews, applied the same word to mental phenomena of an artistic as well as of a religious character, and will serve to make plain our meaning. A work of art is an embodiment of a certain ideal that has sprung up in the soul of the artist in consequence of certain influences exerted by his environment. And in proportion that it is a true work of art, possessing the real fire of genial inspiration, it will awaken in the mind of the sympathetic beholder the same idea that thrilled

* As an infallible *statutory* revelation of truths to be believed, and precepts to be observed, the Bible would have to be pronounced a complete failure. For such a revelation ought to leave no room for uncertainty or doubt in regard to anything. It ought to speak in such way as to cut off all occasion for difference of opinion, among good men, at least. But the Bible does not so speak. There is scarcely a question in theology in regard to which the Bible has not been made to teach opposite views. Surely, if God meant to give us an infallible code by the outward application of which all questions are to be settled, as questions are settled in courts of law by appeals to the statutes, then He has made a mistake in giving us the Bible such as it is. For this may be quoted by equally honest and good men on opposite sides of the same question; as we know, for example, that it is quoted in favor of infant baptism and against infant baptism, in favor of predestination and against predestination, in favor of episcopacy and against episcopacy, in favor of the divinity of Christ and against the divinity of Christ—and so on of other dogmas too numerous to mention. What good is there in having an infallible code whose interpretation is so uncertain? Does not this difference of interpretation prove that this conception of the Bible and this use of it must be radically wrong?

the soul of the artist when he was engaged in the production of it. A true poem must be capable of awakening, in the soul of the poetic reader at least, the same poetic fire that burned in the soul of the poet while he was pouring forth his verses. Now it is the peculiarity of Scripture that it enables the sympathetic religious reader to conceive the same religious ideas and sentiments that swelled the souls of the writers at the time when they were writing. There is in the language of the Bible a certain spiritual glow—a warm breath, that is felt at times even by the dullest reader. In order to feel this peculiarity one need only to read certain chapters in the Old Testament, and then read the same accounts in the pages of Josephus. The latter contains an abundance of dry rhetoric and vapid declamation, which, however, excites no admiration and kindles no fire in the soul of the reader; while the former, without any art, and with marvellous simplicity of style, breathes from its pages the very breath of the Spirit of truth, and causes the facts of revelation to touch the reader's mind in a way that carries a spiritually vitalizing influence to his heart. And this peculiarity is what we call *the inspiration of Scripture*.

Precisely in what this peculiarity consists it may be difficult to define; as it is difficult also to define that which distinguishes a true work of art from the mere prosaic product of a mechanical operation—a true poem for example, from a set of verses made by the aid of a rhyming dictionary. One can better feel the difference than define it. In the case of a work of art there must be a living ideal and an adequate expression of that ideal. For the apprehension of the ideal by the observer the form in which it is expressed is all important. The ideal must look through the form, as the human soul looks through the body. A real poem consists of high thought expressed in corresponding language. It is the mutual adaptation of high thought and high language that constitutes the inspiration of the poem, that is, the power of exciting high thought in the mind of the reader; although the proper soul of the poem consists in the thought, not in the words; and it is the soul that creates the form, not

the form the soul.* So, in like manner, it is the living divine thought, born of direct contact with the Spirit of revelation, and expressed in a form and style of language perfectly adapted to the divine thought, that constitutes the inspiration of the Bible. That which constitutes, for our apprehension at least, a most essential element in the quality of inspiration, is precisely this peculiarity of form and style, in virtue of which we are enabled to communicate directly and effectively with the soul or substance of truth within.

Still the soul or thought, here also, is the original or primary element that created the form or language; not the reverse. And the same soul, because it is alive and not dead, is capable of creating more than one form. It does not perish when separated from the particular linguistic form in which it was first clothed. The inspiration of the Bible is not so bound to the grammatical, rhetorical and other peculiarities of the languages in which it first appeared, that it is therefore incapable of being expressed in other languages. On the contrary, the living thought of the Bible may utter itself in diverse tongues, without losing any essential part of its original vitality and fervor. This adaptability of the living thought of the Bible to the forms of different languages is greatly facilitated by the structural simplicity of the tongues in which the Bible was first written, namely, the Hebrew and Hellenistic Greek; the latter, as used in the New Testament, being largely influenced in its grammatical structure by the simple genius of the former. Many a scholarly reader of the New Testament has doubtless wished at times that the Apostles had written in classic Greek. But while, in that case, their writings might have had somewhat more of logical precision, and might perhaps have contained

* We are reminded here of the question, long debated, whether the true poetic feeling may be possessed by any one without the power of poetic expression. Wordsworth held that one may possess the "vision and the faculty divine," and yet want the "accomplishment of verse." Goethe was of the opposite opinion. However this may be, it is certain that no one can communicate his poetic feeling to another, unless he possesses the faculty of poetic expression.

fewer *cruces interpretum*, yet we may be sure that they would have lacked much of their present power of addressing us in our own tongues without any loss of their original force. No translation of Homer or Plato into a modern tongue can entirely reproduce the Greek genius, while scarcely any Christian translation of the New Testament can lack the Christian fire and spirit of the original. Much of the Bible, especially of the Old Testament, is in the form of poetry; but it is such poetry as admits, by the very laws of its structure, of easy reproduction in other languages. It must be added, however, that, as it is only a poet that can translate a poet, or a philosopher that can interpret a philosopher, so it is only a Christian scholar who has himself caught something of the original inspiration of the Bible, that can translate the Bible. It follows, accordingly, that any translation that has caught anything of the original fire of the Bible, though it may lack verbal exactness, and even, like the Septuagint, contain many errors, will still not be without the quality of inspiration, and will be capable of accomplishing the purpose for which the Bible exists. Any doubt that may exist in regard to this point, is put to silence by the extensive use which the writers of the New Testament make of the Septuagint, with all its imperfections, and with its material departures from the Hebrew text.

But while thus the inspiration of the Bible is not rigidly confined to its original text and its original tongues, it still remains true that one of the essential elements of inspiration consists in that peculiarity of form and style, which makes the language of the Bible an appropriate vehicle for the indwelling divine Spirit. We can, therefore in a certain sense, appropriate to our view the term *verbal inspiration*. This term is not popular now. Many who still cling to the idea of a supernatural or miraculous communication of knowledge in inspiration, nevertheless reject the doctrine of *verbal inspiration* which became current after the Reformation, namely, the doctrine that the Holy Spirit dictated, either into the pens or minds of the sacred writers, the very words which they were to commit

to writing, so that, in the original manuscripts at least, every syllable and dot rested upon immediate divine authority.* This view is now generally rejected; but those who still adhere to the substance of the old doctrine, maintain that the Spirit communicated to the writers the ideas or thoughts that were to be expressed, but for the expression of which the writers were left to themselves to find the adequate words. In this way there is explained the diversity of style in the various books of the Bible. Each writer of the Bible wrote in the language and style peculiar to his individuality as well as to his age and nation; but the thought or "concept" was given to him by the Holy Spirit.

But this view presupposes a separation between thought and speech that does not exist in reality. In reality thought and word form but one existence; and no thought is possible without language. For this reason a favorite formula in the Bible for expressing the idea that one thinks, is that "he speaks in his heart." Even if there be no external utterance of words, the occurrence of thought implies that there is at least an inward shaping of words in the mind. There could, therefore, be no communication of thought, as thought, without a communication of words. It is only by means of words that we can communicate our thoughts to others; or rather, cause others to think the same thoughts that are in our minds; for in strictness of signification, thought as such cannot be communicated from one person to another at all. Thought is not an entity separable from mind, and capable of being handed about from one person to another,

*The *Formula Consensus Helvetici*, of the year 1675, maintains that the Old Testament is inspired "tum quoad consonas, tum quoad vocalia, sive puncta ipsa, sive punctorum saltem potestatum, et tum quoad res, tum quoad verba." And by inspiration there is meant here *impartation* of the subject matter of the sacred books. Calovius, a Lutheran theologian of the seventeenth century, whose daily prayer was the charitable petition, "Imple me, Domine, odio hereticorum," says: "It is impious and profane audacity to change a single point in the Word of God, and to substitute a smooth breathing for a rough one, or a rough for a smooth one." He either forgot, or did not know, that the original manuscripts of the Bible had neither breathings, accents, nor punctuation marks.

like a material object. Thought is a state or form of mind itself; and each one must, therefore, form his own thought, either by occasion of words addressed to him as signs of thought, or by occasion of impressions made upon his organs of sense, either external or internal. The fact remains, then, that thought can be communicated only by means of words, which the human mind, in its collective capacity, has produced as expressive signs of its own inward states. And it appears, accordingly, that the theory of *verbal inspiration* is the only form in which the notion of a miraculous or extra-psychological communication of knowledge can lay any claim at all to the attribute of rationality.* But we believe that this whole notion is untenable and must be rejected. The revelation took place, not in the form of words or finished thoughts proclaimed from the sky, but in the form of objective facts and impressions. The knowledge of these facts and the meaning of these impressions were acquired by the writers of Scripture in a manner conformable to the ordinary psychological laws; but the peculiar *mental tone* or *mood* produced by this knowledge, imparted to their written compositions a peculiar form or style adapted to produce the same mental tone in the soul of the reader.† In so far, then, as the efficiency of the Bible for the purpose for which it exists, de-

* We hold to the idea of the possibility of direct psychical impressions by the Divine Spirit, but such impressions are not thoughts. They can be translated into thoughts only by the mind's own intellectual activity, and in this operation there always exists the possibility of error. The correct interpretation of these direct spiritual impressions results only from a long educational process through which humanity is passing under the guiding hand of God. They belong, however, to the method of God's self-manifestation to the human spirit. But this is revelation, not inspiration.

† Or shall we say that the effect produced by the devout reading of the Bible is due simply to a direct influence of the Holy Spirit accompanying such reading? In this case there would be no *formal difference* at all between the Bible and other religious books; for such influence of the Holy Spirit may be exercised in connection with the reading of any such books, and is believed to be exercised especially in connection with the hearing of sermons. It has, however, always been the belief of the Christian world that the Bible differs *formally* from all other religious books; and that difference we believe to be due to its *inspiration*, in the sense explained above.

pends upon the perfect adaptation of its words to its thoughts, in so far we can allow a certain right to the theory of *verbal inspiration*.

We can also, in a certain sense, appropriate the term *plenary inspiration*, namely, in the sense that the *whole* Bible is inspired, and that this inspiration makes it *fully adequate* for the purpose for which it is intended. The whole Bible is inspired, because there is in the whole of it the breath of the Spirit of revelation, that wrought in the history of the chosen people from Abraham to St. John, and that still works in the history of Christianity. The whole Bible is inspired, because it all testifies of Christ. But this does not mean that every part of the Bible is *equally* inspired, and therefore of equal value for the development of Christian life and thought. Origen says that "Jesus and Paul were alike full of the Holy Spirit, but the capacity of Paul was much less than that of Jesus, though each was filled according to his measure." And, to use an illustration of Richard Baxter's, we may say that, as the soul is in a man's whole body, and yet is not in the hairs of the head and in the nails of the fingers and toes in the same way and measure that it is in the heart and in the brain, so the spirit of revelation is in the whole Bible, and yet it is not in the same way and measure in all the books of the Bible, nor even in all the parts of the same book. Chronicles, and Esther, and Proverbs, and the Song of Solomon are not inspired in the same measure as the Gospel of St. John; nor are Paul's statements concerning marriage and celibacy inspired in the same measure as his grand psalm on charity in the letter to the Corinthians. Nor are all Biblical writings of equal value to the Church. There are portions of the Bible that are comparatively of little importance, and that could be lost without impairing the integrity of revelation; as, in fact, some apostolic as well as prophetic writings have doubtless been lost.*

* St. Paul wrote at least two epistles that have not been preserved in the canon of the New Testament, namely, one to the Corinthians, referred to 1 Cor. 5: 9, and one to the Laodiceans, referred to Col. 4: 16. Are we to suppose that these were not inspired? Surely not. And yet their loss has not been fatal to Christianity.

These unessential portions of Scripture serve only as a *setting* to the essential facts of revelation. Their value is not in themselves, but in the gems which they enclose.

Then, again, the inspiration of the Bible is plenary in the sense that it is *complete*, rendering the Bible fully adequate to the purpose for which it exists. This purpose is to serve as a medium for the full knowledge of revelation, and thus as a condition for the full development of the religious life. All that is necessary for man to know in order to live the highest moral and religious life is contained in the Bible, in a form that carries the evidence of its truthfulness on its face. In other words, the Bible enables us to know enough of God, of His nature and character, of His thought and will, and of His counsels and purposes, to fulfill to the utmost the design of our existence. When, however, the Bible is regarded as a storehouse of all manner of infallible information on all manner of subjects, theological, psychological, ethical, physical, historical, chronological, geological, astronomical, and so forth, then it is disappointing, for it is not designed for such a universal purpose. Its writers were not omniscient. Their inspiration did not make them infallible, or exempt them from any possibility of error. They claim for themselves no such attribute. They do not, as we have already seen, claim the quality of inspiration in any sense specifically different from that in which it belongs to all other saints. Though holy men, who speak as they are moved by the Holy Spirit, they are nevertheless but men; and their speech must necessarily be subject to the same limitations which belong to all human speech.

In one respect, indeed, the inspiration of the writers of Scripture differed from that of later Christians of eminent spiritual endowments, namely, in respect of the fact that they were *original witnesses* of the revelation, which, of course, no later Christians could be. And so the Bible differs from all other religious books, even of the highest value, by reason of the fact that it is the *original record* of revelation. This, of course, is a difference of very serious import. The position of the writers

of Scripture in the religious history of the world was unique; and so also their subjective endowments must have been unique. There have never been any other such men, either before or since, as the authors of Scripture, possessing just such mental and spiritual endowments as they possessed. Their talents were singular, even as their position and calling were singular. A man is what he is only as the product of his time and of his environment; and it is, therefore, only in the midst of his environment that he can be and do what, by Divine Providence, he is intended to be and to do. Homer was possible only in Greece during the eighth century before Christ; and Shakespeare was possible only in the England of the time of Elizabeth. And so the Apostles were possible only in the time of Christ, and under Syrian skies. And in order to have a full conception of the meaning of their inspiration, we must take into consideration both their unique position in the world's spiritual history and their peculiar mental endowments and spiritual characteristics. Their inspiration was a peculiar mental condition, determined both by their original mental and moral constitution and by the peculiar combination of spiritual circumstances in the midst of which they found themselves placed, and which can never recur again in the history of the world. Prophets and apostles, like poets, are not made, but born. They are born with those mental and spiritual gifts which, under the influence of their subsequent environment, develop into the condition of inspiration; and gift and environment are pre-adapted to each other in the divine plan and government of the world. "Spirits are not finely touched, but to fine issues." God's prophets are not only endowed with keenness of spiritual perception, but they stand near also to the central current of the world's advancing life, every pulse-beat of which affects their sensibility. It is this that makes them in some measure seers of future events. They are able to see far into the future, because they see deep into the present. They have a profound apprehension of God's character and purposes, and of the laws and principles of His government, as well as of the moral constitution of the world, and

of the relations and consequences of finite actions, and are able, therefore, to discern events in their beginnings, and to predict things that are future. It is in this sense that Jehovah does nothing without revealing His secret unto His servants the prophets.

In respect of their unique endowment, and in respect of the singularity of their position in the world's religious history, then, the inspiration of the writers of Scripture was something peculiar to themselves. No reformer, preacher or theologian could, therefore, ever be inspired just in the same way in which the prophets and apostles were inspired; not because his subjective spiritual condition might not be the same, but because his relation to the objective course of revelation could not be the same. In respect of its essential nature, however, the inspiration of the writers of Sacred Scripture was not specifically different from that of other Christians. It did not contravene the laws of their mental faculties, or abrogate the normal use of their reason; and while it made them *competent* and *sufficient* witnesses of revelation, it did not make them infallible in all their utterances and in all their writings.

The quality of absolute infallibility is one that is not needed at all in order to make the Bible a sufficient record of divine revelation; and the claim of this quality is one that cannot be sustained by the actual facts of the Bible as they lie before us.* There is in the Bible the infallible divine truth—for all truth as such is infallible—that is required in order to make men wise

* The question concerning the infallibility or inerrancy of the Bible is one that cannot be decided on dogmatic grounds. Infallibility is not a corollary of inspiration. The question can be decided only by a critical study of the Bible itself; and such study does not lead to an affirmative conclusion. There are especially historical, geographical and scientific statements contained in the Bible that do not square with facts as they are now understood. The usual methods of removing these inaccuracies by arbitrary assumptions, as, for example, of interpolations, or corruptions of the original text, and similar shifts, are something very much like the sin of "handling the word of God deceitfully," which God can certainly not approve. The word of God does not need the service of deception or falsehood; nor can its acceptance be promoted by such service.

unto salvation. But there are in the Bible also innumerable things that have nothing to do with salvation, and in connection with which the human character of the book appears most manifestly. What, for example, has the size of Og's bedstead, or the number of men that fell in a particular battle, or perished in a pestilence, to do with our salvation? But it may be objected that, if we admit this distinction between infallible religious truth and fallible human additions in the Bible—or between the word of God in the Bible and things which are not the word of God—then we have no criterion by which to distinguish the one from the other. To this we would reply that there is, indeed, no criterion or rule by the mechanical application of which we could distinguish between the divine and the human, but that the Christian consciousness is nevertheless a practical criterion that is sufficient for this purpose; just as the cultivated taste of the artist is sufficient to discriminate between a true work of art and its opposite. The application of this criterion, however, must be made in a *moral* way, agreeably to the declaration of Christ: "If any one will do the doctrine, he shall know whether it be of God;" and the result will be moral certainty instead of mechanical infallibility.*

Those who insist on the absolute infallibility or total inerrancy of the Bible as a necessary consequence of its inspiration usu-

* The Holy Spirit has not only given the Church the Bible, but also Himself dwells permanently in the Church to guide her into all truth. On grounds of reason it is as easy to believe that the Holy Spirit renders the Church infallible as it is to believe that He has given to the Church an infallible Bible. Of course such a belief could not be sustained by the hard facts of Church history. Nor is such a belief necessary in order to the conviction that the Spirit, ever present in the Church, will always guide the mind of the Church to what is substantially the right apprehension of the truth contained in the Bible. If the Bible is divine, so also is the Church. And we suppose there are few Protestants now who would hold that "the Bible alone is the religion of Protestants." Without at all going over to Roman Catholicism, we hold that the Church also is an important factor in our religion. And the Christian consciousness of the Church, born of the interaction of innumerable Christian minds under the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit, may be trusted to discriminate, with sufficient accuracy for all practical purposes, between the human and the divine elements in Scripture.

ally claim this quality only for the original autographs of the sacred writers. No translation, it is said, and no copy of the original text, can be infallible; for translations and copies being human productions, they must necessarily share the quality of imperfection with all human things. Indeed, the conception of inspiration itself is by some thus restricted. "The claim for inspiration in behalf of the Scripture records," says Prof. W. P. Beecher, in the American Supplement of the "*Encyclopædia Britannica*," article *Inspiration*, "is limited to the autograph writings and to faithful copies of the same. Though the original Scripture record was perfect, imperfections may creep into the copies." The consequence of this limitation, then, would be that the great majority of Christians, who are not able to read Greek and Hebrew, and even the majority of preachers, who can do no more than spell out sentences by the constant use of grammar and lexicon, have, after all, no infallible Bible, yea, not even an inspired Bible.

But more than this. The original autographs of the several writer have all been lost beyond the possibility of recovery. But the variety of readings which are found in existing manuscripts shows that we do not now possess the original text in its absolute perfection. There are no copies so faithful as to contain no variations from the original. In all existing manuscripts, both of the Old Testament and of the New, there are interpolations, omissions, and emendations which differentiate these manuscripts from the original autographs. The existing Hebrew text probably varies more from the original than does the Greek, although the number of different readings is much smaller, the variant manuscripts having most likely been arbitrarily suppressed by the rulers of the Synagogue. Critical scholarship is, indeed, engaged in correcting the manuscripts, and in restoring as far as possible the original text. But criticism being itself fallible, like any other human science, its results must be fallible likewise; and it cannot, therefore, succeed in giving us an infallible Bible. The infallible Bible, like the poet's golden age, is thus a thing entirely of the past. It can never again

become a present reality. But of what use is it for us to know that the Bible was infallible once, namely, so long as the original autographs were in existence, if we cannot be sure that we now possess it in the same infallible form? Should it be said that any errors which may be shown to be in the Bible, whether they are original or merely the result of transcription, do not affect the substance of religious and moral truth, and that for the actual needs of the religious and moral life the Bible is practically errorless, this we readily and cheerfully admit—*indeed, this is our own position*, for which we hold that it is necessary to contend as for an important citadel of the faith; but, then, we submit that whoever takes this position gives up the idea of infallibility.*

We maintain, however, that there is nothing lost by giving up this idea. What good would an infallible Bible do us, so long as we are not ourselves infallible? An infallible Bible would by no means make our theological knowledge infallible. My knowledge of divine truth is only *my* knowledge; and though it were based upon an infallible Bible, it would be no more infallible than I myself am infallible. In order to make my knowledge infallible I would have need of an infallible teacher, to whom I would have to bow in blind submission, and whose words I would have to repeat as a parrot repeats those of his trainer. Indeed, this idea of an infallible Bible leads further to the idea of an infallible priesthood, and at last to the idea of an infallible Pope. As the great and good Tholuck remarked long ago, any one who cannot be sure of his Christian faith without an infallible Bible, cannot rest until he has made his submission to the infallible prince of the Church sitting in the chair of St. Peter.

* But if the errors which are claimed to be in the Bible are of such a trifling character, and if they do not affect the substance of religious truth, what, it may be asked, is the use of insisting on them? Our answer is that this must be done in the interest of a sound doctrine of inspiration, which is not a trifling matter, but of very great importance. The errors are trifling, but they refute a certain theory of inspiration, and compel us to resort to another more in harmony with the Bible as it is.

To claim absolute infallibility for the Bible is to regard it in the light of a collection of religious and moral truths miraculously communicated from heaven, which can only be understood, then, by the aid of an infallible teacher. This is the manner in which the Koran is believed to have been communicated to Mohammed. The conception of revelation underlying this view, is not the idea of a divine self-manifestation in human life and history, but the notion of a promulgation of doctrines and precepts directly from heaven, somewhat after the manner in which an earthly ruler makes known his will to his subjects. There is only this difference between the two cases, that, while the proclamations and edicts of earthly rulers are usually so clear that there can be no misunderstanding of their import, the edicts of heaven, as they are contained in the Bible, are so ambiguous that men, though convinced of their infallibility, may be forever bandying about their meaning. This conception of revelation as being the proclamation of an infallible code, was the conception of the scholastic theology of the middle ages. Christianity was then usually defined as a "new law" (*nova lex*), miraculously sent down from heaven, deposited in the Bible, entrusted to the Church, and requiring the services of an infallible lawyer always to make it available for the purpose for which it was given.

The Reformers, it is well known, along with other doctrines of the Papacy, rejected also this papal view of the Bible. They, indeed, made the Bible, as the original record of divine revelation, to be the ultimate rule of Christian faith and practice, on the ground of which they ever argued against the papacy and condemned its errors in doctrines and morals. But they said, the Bible exists for everybody and is intended for everybody's use; it is a means of grace for all Christians, and yields its meaning directly to the pious consciousness through the influence of the Spirit of inspiration still breathing in and through it. The Reformers were, indeed, not entirely free from the medieval view of Scripture, as in the nature of the case they could not be; but in principle they had broken with it. And by means

of their conception of the universal destination and intelligibility of sacred Scripture, in consequence of which it ceased to be the exclusive possession of the priesthood and presently became the common property of the Church, they revolutionized the current ideas of revelation and of Christianity. Christianity ceased to be regarded as a *new law*, and came to be viewed more as the power of a new life, holding in organic union with Christ; and the ground of certitude for faith was no longer found in any outward infallible authority, whether of Church or Scripture, but in Christ Himself as apprehended immediately in consciousness. In fact, Christ Himself, as thus apprehended, became the supreme authority for Christian thought.

For the idea of infallibility in general the Reformers cared very little. Practically they often rejected this idea, not merely in its application to the Church, but in its application to the Bible as well. Luther doubted the infallibility of the canon. For some time he had no use for the Apocalypse, though later he somewhat modified his views in regard to this book; and he pronounced the Epistle of James an epistle of straw, because he did not find therein the doctrine of justification by faith; which shows that his judgment was determined, not by any outward authority, but solely by the contents of the sacred books. And he at times doubted the infallibility of the canonical books themselves; questioning, for example, the accuracy of the interpretation of some Old Testament passages in the New, as, for instance, that of Isa. 8 : 18 in Heb. 2 : 18; and accusing St. Paul of false reasoning in his allegorical explanation of Sarah and Hagar in the Epistle to the Galatians, of which he says that it is "*Zum Stich zu schwach*," although he allows that it may serve a good practical purpose in the way of edification. He also admits that, besides the gold, silver, and precious stones, which are contained in the writings of the prophets, there may be mixed in with them wood, hay, and stubble, whose end is to be consumed.* Zwingli and Calvin were equally free in their treatment of the Bible. The latter,

* See Herzog's *Real Encyclopedia*, Vol. VI. p. 695 (old ed.).

for example, freely admits that in matters of historical detail there may be inaccuracies; because the sacred writers, in matters of this kind, when no important consequences were involved, did not trouble themselves about entire precision. In subsequent times, indeed, especially from about the middle of the seventeenth century onward, under the stress of controversy, the old scholastic doctrine of Biblical infallibility was reinstated in Protestantism. The notion again prevailed that the Bible is a divine code whose propositions, if they were but rightly understood and rightly put together, would at once yield an infallible system of theology; and more than one school fancied that it had the right understanding of the Bible, and that its theology therefore must be infallible. But from the time that this change came over the mind of Protestantism, the victorious career of Protestantism was ended. Men felt somehow that if the religious question was one to be decided by an outward infallible authority, it was better to have the pope *and* the Bible on one's side, than simply to have the Bible alone. Has not this been one of the Achilles' heels of Protestantism for the last two hundred years?

We hold, then, that, by rejecting the notion of a mechanical infallibility as belonging to the Bible by virtue of its inspiration, together with that whole view of the Bible as a book of divine statutes which this notion implies, and substituting for this the conception of a vital spiritual energy inhering in the Word of God, and making it quick and powerful for the generating and developing of a spiritual life in the soul, there is not only nothing lost, but much gained. The latter conception is incomparably higher than the former, and makes the Bible now incomparably more valuable. For, as thus conceived, inspiration is a quality that belonged not merely to the original manuscripts of the sacred writers, but it is a quality that cannot be lost in any translation, and belongs, therefore, to every copy of the Bible that is now in the hands of the humblest Christian. Moreover, as thus conceived, the Bible ceases to be a book intended exclusively for the use of the priesthood, and shows itself to be

adapted to the understanding and edification of all Christians. As it no longer needs an infallible teacher to disclose its purpose, it needs no longer to be excluded from the hands and eyes of the laity, as is done consistently where the other conception prevails. And, finally, in this view, the Bible no longer fails to accomplish its object, but really answers the purpose for which it is intended. As a complete statutory revelation of commandments and doctrines the Bible must be considered a failure; for the best of men, with the best of intentions, have never yet agreed in the interpretation of it in this sense. But as a means of grace, intended for the quickening and development of the religious life in the soul, it has always and everywhere been successful. While it has failed in making infallible theologians or theologies, it has not failed in making Christians.*

The conception of inspiration here put forward relieves the Christian believer from all anxiety or concern about the authorship of the several books of the Bible. The question concerning the authenticity of these books is interesting in itself, but it has nothing to do with the question of inspiration. The quality of a work of art is not determined by the name of its author, but by what the work is in itself. If a statue be discovered in the ruins of an ancient city, its quality is determined by the evidence of the artistic character which it bears in itself, and not by the question as to who made it. And so a Biblical writing must bear in itself the evidence of its inspiration quite independently of any reference to the personality of the author. Modern criticism has made it evident to all scholars, who are not afraid to trust their senses, that Moses did not write the

* That the Bible has an office also to perform in the progressive evolution of theological thought in the Church is, of course, not to be denied, but affirmed. But the question as to the precise relation of the Bible to the progress of theological thought, or to the progressive formation of doctrines and dogmas, is a large one, and we cannot in this paper enter into a discussion of it. It is enough to have shown that the old method of using Scripture as though it were a legal code, which leads to such contradictory results in the hands of equally honest and pious men, must be erroneous.

Pentateuch, nor David the Psalter.* That matters not, so far as the inspiration of these books is concerned. They have always approved themselves to the Church as inspired, and they will continue to do so hereafter. There are at the present moment grave doubts about the authorship of the fourth Gospel; but these do not touch the question of its inspiration, nor of its value as disclosing the image of the divine-human Christ, in its highest and purest form, as it impressed itself upon the mind of the Apostolic Church.

This conception of inspiration, moreover, puts an end forever to the old battle between the Bible and science, and relieves the Christian apologist from carrying a burden that is becoming too heavy for him. With this view of inspiration and of the design of revelation, it is no longer necessary, for example, to maintain the literal accuracy of the account of the creation in Genesis, and then to perform impossible exegetical feats for the purpose of bringing it into harmony with incontestable facts of science, such as the identification of the six creative days with the various eras and epochs of geology; or to assume the literal historicalness of the narrative of the fall, and then to explain how it happened that Eve was left alone at the tree of temptation, how the serpent could address her in human speech, and what physical changes there occurred in the serpent after the pronouncement of the curse. Nor is it necessary any longer to accept the literal accuracy of the story of the flood, and then to exert our ingenuity to find out whence sufficient water could have been obtained to cover the whole earth to the depth of fifteen cubits above the tops of the highest mountains,

* Of course there is presupposed also a sufficient degree of ability and a sufficient amount of patience to follow the arguments of the critics. The trouble with many is that they allow themselves to pronounce judgment without possessing either. They cannot conceive, for example, how *they* could so analyze the Pentateuch as to determine various documents in it. They have read it and have never been struck by any documents in it; and, therefore, they sneer at the labor of the critics as mere child's play. That is as if one were to propose to decide questions of science, not by knowledge, but by ignorance. The writer knows nothing of the construction of a phonograph. If, therefore, he were to conclude that it is impossible to make a phonograph, and proclaim this conclusion to the world, he would make himself very ridiculous in the eyes of all sober people.

or to explain how the animals could have been brought unto Noah from all quarters of the globe, and how they could all be accommodated in the ark. We need no longer feel ourselves bound to explain discrepancies of historical statements by inventing imaginary circumstances of which we know absolutely nothing. How the angels could have had intercourse with the daughters of men; how the cony could be said to chew the cud; how Saul could have begun to reign over Israel at the tender age of one year (1 Sam. 13: 1, Heb.); how it could have been at the same time Jehovah and Satan that stirred up David to number Israel (2 Sam. 24: 1; 1 Chron. 21: 1); how the blind Bartimeus of Jericho could have been two men as well as one (Mark 10: 46; Matt. 20: 30); how the one demoniac of Gadara could have developed into two (Mark 5: 2; Luke 8: 27; Matt. 8: 28); how the name of one person could be exchanged for that of another without involving any error, as that of Isaiah for Malachi (Mark 1: 2), or of Abiathar for Ahimelech (Mark 2: 26; 1 Sam. 21: 1), or of Jeremiah for Zechariah (Matt. 27: 9; Zech. 11: 12)—these and similar matters will no longer give us any serious concern. As the physical and historical errors in Shakespeare do not mar the æsthetic truth which Shakespeare meant to convey, or destroy the æsthetic or even the moral effect of his dramas, so any physical, historical, scientific, or ethical errors that may be found in the Bible, do not mar the religious truth which the Bible is intended to convey, or hinder its religious effect. And we shall, therefore, no longer be surprised when we are told even that some of those Bible narratives which serve as media for the inculcation of most precious religious truth—truth which needed to be inculcated particularly at the time when these narratives were composed—rest not upon literal history or fact, but upon popular legends and myths. Nor need we any longer worry when we find that the apostles, in quoting from the Old Testament, often quoted loosely from memory, and were not anxiously careful to preserve literal exactness, as a modern theologian would be; for the truth which they intended to communicate is not dead law, like that contained in the pages of the

Pandects, but living and life-giving spirit capable of exerting its power in more than one form of words.

Under this new conception of inspiration, which was substantially that of the Reformers, in distinction from that both of the earlier and later Scholasticism, the Bible ceases to be an infallible code of doctrines and precepts, directly let down from heaven, or an arsenal of infallible proof-texts, as it is perhaps still by too many regarded, and becomes a book of life—a medium, through the Spirit, of direct communion of the believing soul with the living and glorified Christ, who is Himself the only absolute and infallible authority for Christian faith and life. And in the end it is not the Bible that authenticates Christ to us, but Christ that authenticates the Bible.* We believe not in Christ on account of the Bible, but we believe the Bible on account of Christ. And Christ must be the ultimate Interpreter of Scripture, also—Christ in His people, or Christ in the Christian consciousness. He alone is the truth; and all the utterances and teachings even of prophets and holy men, though they should claim a “thus saith the Lord” for their authority, must at last be brought to the judgment-seat of Christ for revision and correction. Whatever is incompatible or inconsistent with the spirit of Christ, though it may be in the Bible, and may once have claimed the stamp of divine authority, cannot be identical with eternal divine truth, and must now be rejected. Such teaching, for example, as that contained in the imprecatory Psalms, and such sentiments as those expressed in passages like 1 Sam. 15: 2, and 2 Sam. 16: 10, must give way before the superior authority of the Sermon on the Mount. In the words of Luther, Christ is Lord also of the Bible; and we should be more anxious to hold with Christ, than to hold with the Bible; convinced, however, that if we have the mind of Christ, we shall also have the *true* mind that is in Scripture. If our faith be *Christian* it will be *Biblical*; but it may be biblical without being Christian; for it may have the letter, but lack the spirit of the Bible.

* “Das Ansehen der heiligen Schrift kann nicht den Glauben an Christum begründen, vielmehr muss dieser schon vorangesezt werden um der heiligen Schrift ein besonderes Ansehen einzuräumen.” SCHLEIERMACHEE.

IV.

THE TREND OF HISTORY.

BY REV. J. B. RUST, A.M.

IN observing the activities of the present age and musing upon those of departed centuries, the question naturally arises, Whither are we drifting? The perpetual movement of mankind makes for what goal? When and where will all the rays of race and national, political and religious coloring, which the past reflects into the present, which are cast by the present into the future, concentrate into a destiny achieved? What is the destiny of mankind? It is evident, if there be any truth in Revelation, touching the hope of man and the Divine intention concerning him, that the silent movement of the race from age to age, from discovery to discovery, from attainment to attainment, despite the incessant turmoil and struggle, the frequent wreck and failure along the path of time, and the subtle suspicion of a fateful flux, conceals a mighty march toward the realization of a high, an immortal purpose.

To discover the true philosophy of history, in answer to these inquiries, must ever remain one of the most important and difficult quests of the student. It is not only an interesting and profitable pleasure, but also possesses a practical bearing upon the spirit of the present and the events of the future. Whatever the student does, should be unselfishly done. The fruits of research, whenever they can advance the cause of enlightenment and benefit the race, ought to be made the possession of mankind. The better, the truer, the profounder man's knowledge is concerning himself, his place in nature, his rela-

tion to the past and to the future, the more rounded will be the life of each separate individual.

"But words are things, and a small drop of ink
Falling, like dew, upon a thought, produces
That which makes thousands, perhaps millions think." *

"Historia testis temporum, lux veritatis, vita memorie, magis-
tra vitae, nuntia vetustatis." †

More than this, such study, by acting upon personal existence, not only hastens the advent of a great millennial era and the higher development of the moral consciousness of the brotherhood of man, but also the break of that day when the last shackle of superstition shall fall to the ground and the race, in a diviner sphere, shall enter upon the inheritance for which centuries of trial and yearning are fitting it, an inheritance free, from the stain of error and the sorrows of worldly captivity.

Pessimistic views of the condition of our times cannot be justified. They result from an insufficient knowledge or false interpretation of history, and exhibit a very limited appreciation of the achievements of modern social and religious life.

It is foolish and cowardly to despair of the power of truth, or by way of compromise to adopt a philosophy of history such as that advocated by Buckle, ‡ who, rejecting what he calls the metaphysical dogma of Free Will and the theological dogma of Predestined Events, undertakes to explain all the phenomena of society by the reciprocal influences of man and nature. "Thus we have man modifying nature and nature modifying man; while out of this mutual modification all events must necessarily spring." Any theory may contain some grains of truth, but no such one-sided principle upon which is to be based an interpretation of the life of mankind will either satisfy the reason or do justice to the dignity of human hopes and the sentiment of an enlightened conscience. Notwithstanding certain unwarranted assumptions wildly suggested by the leading discoveries of modern science, it is utterly impossible to reduce ✓

* Byron, *Don Juan*, Canto III. 88.

† Cicero.

‡ Buckle, *Hist. of Civilization in England*, Vol. I. p. 15.

the activities of the universe to the workings of a mechanism, however complex, a piece of machinery in which one wheel runs within another, nature the larger, man the lesser. Barring certain local changes, due on the one hand to sudden, unusual and oftentimes destructive outbursts of elemental forces, and on the other to the industry of civilized man, the state of nature as we find it now, has, in the main, been the same for unnumbered ages. The descriptions of the topography of early Britain and Germany, preserved in the writings of Latin historians, are in many instances exaggerated and fanciful, and can only be cited with the greatest discrimination as historic witnesses of the degree to which the hand of man may modify the order of things in the domain of nature. The Romans with their galleys explored only the rugged shores of those then distant islands, and formed their notion of the condition of the country from the appearance of the coast and the rude savages who with weapons of primitive construction sought to protect themselves against invasion. The soldier and the sailor here found most fruitful material for tales of wonder, with which, on their return, to regale the inhabitants of the Eternal City. An English historian says : "The shores of Britain were, to the polished race which dwelt by the Bosphorus, objects of mysterious horror, such as that with which the Ionians of the age of Homer had regarded the straits of Scylla and the Laestrygonian cannibals. There was one province of the island in which, as Procopius had been told, the ground was covered with serpents, and the air was such that no man could inhale it and live. To this desolate region the spirits of the departed were ferried over from the land of the Franks at midnight. A strange race of fishermen performed the ghastly office. The speech of the dead was distinctly heard by the boatmen ; their weight made the keel sink deep into the water ; but their forms were invisible to mortal eye." *

In the same way crude notions, that were handed down to succeeding ages, became current concerning the character of ancient

* Macaulay, Hist. England, Vol. I. p. 4.

Germany.* Latin writers, like Tacitus, Strabo and Seneca, describe that country as being rugged and wild and covered with swamps and impenetrable forests. The valleys of the Rhine were vast morasses, and marsh and woodland extended to the banks of the Elbe. Countless streams flowed in unfixed beds through the trackless wastes, and the atmosphere, charged with mist and fog, poured forth continuous rains. Great masses of ice and avalanches of snow rolled down from the mountain heights, burying horse and rider in one common ruin. Frequent earthquakes shook the towering Alps. The climate was so cold that the wine froze in the earthen vessels that contained it, and, bursting them, remained standing upon the ground in huge cakes of ice. Thus Germany came to be looked upon as the end of the world, fitted only to be the home of wild beasts.

Men accustomed to enjoy perpetual summer under an Italian sky readily created, adopted and promulgated these exaggerated ideas, owing in part to ignorance of the real state of nature in that day, and in part to the fact that the Romans carried on their campaigns principally in Fresia, Westphalia and along the coast of Hanover, where there is a great deal of marshland. Moreover, the Germans chose to fight their battles in forest and morass, because there they held their enemies at a disadvantage. But that the inland seas and the streams were no larger during the Roman invasions than they now are is proved by the remains of camps and bridges. Those regions that at the present time allow of the highest cultivation and are the most productive were just as fruitful, had they been husbanded, two thousand years ago. And in contradiction of the accepted opinion that ancient Germany was distinguished for perpetual cold, Pliny says the heat in summer often became so great that the Rhine would scarcely float a skiff.

Since the close of the glacial period, when the globe began to be habitable, nature assumed the fixed condition it now maintains. It is possible to trace a gradual shifting of the earth's axis, which has influenced the character and direction of the

* Barth, Hist. Germany, Vol. III., p. 7.

isothermal lines, and thus the migrations of birds and animals, and moved northward or southward the territorial boundaries of indigenous plants. But whatever scientific conclusions as to possibilities may be drawn therefrom, they do not in the least argue that any epochal modifications have been made upon man in the past, during the time the race has lived on the globe, other than those that have existed from dim antiquity, when they were first established.*

And when we compare the powers of man with the forces of nature, we discover the fact that, however permanent in their effect they appear to be, the victories of man over nature are not absolute, but only conditional. He builds great cities, adorning them with rich temples and magnificent palaces. By artificial canals he unites sea with sea. Sometimes he converts desert places into gardens. He undermines mountains and valleys in his search for precious metals. He constructs huge mausoleums for the dead, and commemorates his historic achievements with shafts of granite. But the giant forces of nature he vaunts himself to have set at bay reassert themselves with a maddened energy that laughs at the fruits of industry and genius. His cities are buried beneath the *débris* and lava hurled in seething masses from the crater of a volcano. An earthquake shatters his mines. A conflict of the elements of the air, and

* The effect of any speculation concerning the age of the human family, as related to the essentials of the Christian religion, is immaterial. In the first place, the chronology of the Old Testament fails to settle the question. Again, some of the leading spirits of the Early Church, who touched upon the subject in their discussions with the Gnostics, quite boldly declared the claim of certain heretics for a longer period to be tenable, without endangering the Catholic faith. A striking passage in the writings of Irenaeus goes to show that the unscientific speculations of ancient scholars, *rather than the Hebrew Scriptures*, were to blame for the establishment of the literal interpretation of the Creation Days, which has received the scathing criticism of modern physicists. "And there are some, again, who relegate the death of Adam to the thousandth year."

"Whether, therefore, with respect to disobedience, which is death; whether, with respect to this cycle of days, they died on the day in which they did also eat; or whether he (Adam) did not overstep the thousand years, but died within their limit,—it follows that, in regard to all these significations, God is indeed true." (Irenaeus, *Against Heresies*, Book V., chap. 28, art. 2.)

the roll of mighty waters sweeps away every vestige of his works of art, that the old order of things may reappear, in mingled ghastly and romantic wildness. The storm fades away, the oscillation ceases, and the sun again casts his rays upon him, but as a vagabond, as a beggar, as a dependent upon nature that does not own his dependence, and mockingly reminds him of his end by bidding him to gaze at the exhumed corpses whose graves he had honored with monuments of marble.*

In striking contrast with this theory of mutual modification, Lotze, one of the wisest philosophers of modern times, in grappling with the problem of human life, and preparing to give an answer to the questions that assail every meditative mind, presents this melancholy picture of terrestrial relations: "The further man drifts away from the patriarchal state of isolation, and the more conscious he becomes of the inexhaustible fruitfulness with which the earth for countless centuries has brought forth race upon race, varying greatly in form and disposition, and yet essentially moulded after the same type, yes, all of them in the character and conditions of their life resembling the animal species that in still greater number, appearing and disappearing by myriads, inhabit the most forgotten corners of the globe; the more distinctly this fact presents itself to the consciousness, the more timid will man be to begin to think about the value of his own existence, and the belief that he is merely one of the transitory phenomena which an eternal primitive force, reveling in creation and destruction, aimlessly calls forth and permits again to vanish, will take possession of his mind."† Whatever may have been the original design in the creation of the world, its present condition, one it has maintained for ages with but slight variation, betrays the fact that it is not intended, that it is not fitted to be the permanent abode of man.

It cannot be denied that the laws of nature act with marvelous precision throughout the universe, nor that they proclaim the existence of a Divine Mind of infinite wisdom that gave them birth. But if one should attempt on any theory whatso-

* Genesis iii. 17-20.

† Lotze, *Mikrokosmos*, Vol. II., p. 449.

ever, to confine the destiny of man wholly to his material relations, a problem in respect of the true end of human life, *defying solution*, would at once arise. For the very laws that obtain in the material world and daily challenge man's admiration, are alike life and death to him. And what they are for him, that are they also for all animals and plants. Hence, in a sense, the utterance of a celebrated scientist and historian must be conceded to be true: "The earth, though very beautiful, is very far from being perfect. The plants and animals we see are only the wrecks of a broken series, an incomplete and therefore unworthy testimonial of the Almighty Power."* It was some such impression as this that led to the formulation of the Manichean philosophy, which, after the death of its author, found so wide an adoption among the Gnostic Christians, and existed in scattered societies as late as the Middle Ages. By reason of a plausible argument and a powerful array of traditional dualistic speculations adduced in its support, we need not wonder that the genius of Augustine, who in early life had himself been an advocate of its tenets, was incited to combat it. The idea that the natural world, morally speaking, is the enemy rather than the friend of man, undoubtedly gave occasion to the practice of asceticism, which already prevailed to some extent in heathen times and later on was introduced into the Christian Church. Whatever inability man may have to secure a purely material dominion over nature, the cause of his servile relation to his physical surroundings must not be sought in some inherent evil breathed into the world of matter by a demiurge. The insurmountable obstacles one meets with in attempting to adjust the facts of experience to a theory like that of mutual modification, result from the law of sin and death to which the whole creation somehow became subjected, † and make that theory not only untenable, but force one to seek for the key to the problem of life in some other philosophy, in some other sphere. It is true, in a way, that man, by reason of his intellectual and moral

* Draper, *Intel. Devel. of Europe*, Vol. II. p. 334.

† Romans viii. 19-24.

capabilities, stands at the head of all creation, but only then when these are given their proper place in the scale of being and the study of humanity. Otherwise man appears as only one of the passing phenomena of nature, perhaps the highest, all in all, but a product still. For from a physiological point of view, "the orang-outang resembles the human both externally and internally. His brain is moulded like ours. He has a broad chest, wide shoulders, a face and a skull constructed similar to ours. His heart, lungs, liver, spleen, stomach and intestines are like ours. Tyson named forty-eight parts that man has in common with the ape. And in the things he is said to do, his vices and follies even, perhaps also the periodicity of his diseases, he resembles man. Therefore it is to be expected that there exists something human-like in the activities of his soul. The beaver builds his dams in obedience to instinct. He was created for that purpose. Beyond that he cannot go. He is incapable of association with man, of sharing his thoughts and passions. But the ape no longer possesses a determining instinct. His powers of thought lie very near the line of reason, in the humble sphere of imitation. He imitates everything, and therefore his brain must be constituted to make countless combinations of sensual ideas, of which no other animal is capable. Neither the wise elephant nor the trusty dog can accomplish what he can. He strives to perfect himself, but in vain. The door is locked. He is unable to associate ideas."*

Huxley says: "Whatever system of organs be studied, the comparison of their modifications in the ape series leads to one and the same result—that the structural differences which separate man from the gorilla and chimpanzee are not so great as those which separate the Gorilla from the lower apes."† But in order to correct any misrepresentation of opinions which might indicate that the structural differences between man and even the highest apes are small and insignificant, he adds: "Every bone of a Gorilla bears marks by which it might be distinguished

* Herder, *Ideas to Philosophy of History*, p. 180.

† Huxley, *Man's Place in Nature*, p. 123.

from the corresponding bone of a man, and in the present creation at any rate no intermediate link bridges over the gap between *Homo* and *Troglodytes*."

✓ Thus we finally arrive at the conclusion that no philosophy which ignores the spiritual side of mankind, is capable of offering a satisfactory solution of the problem of history. Natural History simply shows us a being superior in instincts and achievements to all created things, but a being too that is subjected to an inexorable physical law which obtains throughout the universe of matter, the law of birth, growth and death, unchangeably the same midst all surroundings as to the common end. For surroundings, though they may augment the miseries of existence, or modify and assuage them, do not shift the course of fate nor stop its march. One individual after another involuntarily leaps into existence, lives through a series of years and scenes, and then, though reared midst the action of the proudest civilization, passes away.

We take great pride in the progress of the nineteenth century, the inventions, discoveries and conveniences of our modern life. But these treasured fruits of science and peace are after all simply compromises with nature and do not alter in the least the ultimate lot of man. They only cast an air of refinement about his fate. Misfortune, discord, terrible diseases and death, despite all these, still continue to invade the palace and the hovel. Here and there voices from the abyss of Naturalism strive to grow eloquent over a creature divested by theory of all spiritual dignity, such as is reflected from man even in the lowest stages of degradation and savagery because of the end for which he was made. Their eloquence is mimicry, hollow and hopeless. It is devoid of great thoughts that train the emotions, move the soul, and speak to it of better things to come. What mean the threnodies which are forced from families, tribes and nations as the years and the centuries roll on? Are we cursed with yearnings, with hopes, with the power of thought, with conscience, with desires to touch, if no more, only the garment's hem of a higher life, or with the strange thraldom of iniquity

and guilt; a very hell on earth, to learn for ourselves and to teach others, that we are superior in rank among the products of Nature, but for the rest only rise to the surface of the sea of oblivion to catch a fleeting glimpse of a shimmering sheen and then sink back again into its dark and noiseless depths? Is there no healing voice anywhere in the universe whose recorded wisdom disentangles the web of human experience, resolves life into its proper relations, sends into it the angel of hope and reveals to the race the true dignity and end of being? We need not seek long to find an utterance, and one whose testimony is both divine and conclusive. "And seeing the multitudes, he went up into a mountain: and when he had sat down, his disciples came unto him; and he opened his mouth and taught them, saying: Blessed are the poor in spirit, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. Blessed are they which do hunger and thirst after righteousness, for they shall be filled. Blessed are the merciful for they shall obtain mercy. Blessed are the pure in heart, for they shall see God. Blessed are the peacemakers, for they shall be called the children of God. Blessed are they which are persecuted for righteousness' sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven. Blessed are ye when men shall revile you, and persecute you, and shall say all manner of evil against you falsely, for my sake. Rejoice and be exceeding glad, for great is your reward in heaven: for so persecuted they the prophets which were before you."* The witness of this Voice, not only here but elsewhere also, covers the whole ground of inquiry and bridges the chasm of doubt and theory which any philosophy that ignores the spiritual in man, can neither lessen in width nor sweep away. It speaks to us of possibilities that lie open to human attainment, and in the realization of which, man's nature, whether in individual form, as a nation or as a race, finds its perfection and ultimate glorification.

This is the key to the philosophy of history. The "terrible

* Matthew v. 1-12.

dualism" of man's nature proves it to be so. "Formed out of the dust of the ground, yet made in the image and similitude of God; children of the Most High, yet crushed before the moth; drinking in iniquity like water, yet filled with the inspiration of the Almighty which giveth him understanding; a worm and a thing of naught, yet with a destiny higher than the sons of light; the angel has him by the hand, or the serpent by the heart; he may rise to the heights of heaven, he may sink to the abyss of hell."*

The trend of history proves it. Whatever scientists may determine with reference to man's relation, physically, to the phenomena of nature; whatever order in the scale of existences may be assigned to him by naturalism, the march of events from the earliest times to the present hour, as interpreted by the aid of "the Light which shineth in darkness," establishes the fact ✓ that the destiny of man is not limited to earthly duration nor confined to mutual modifications of a material kind, but beginning here, extends beyond this lower sphere and finds its fulfillment in the realm of the ideal, in the land of the true, the beautiful and the good.

The word progress as applied to the improvement of human conditions, comprehends every true advance made from time to time, in the training of the faculties of the soul, in leading society further and further away from that brutal, selfish, helpless, warlike, crude and defenceless state, both morally and physically, in which man at some time during his existence on the globe, began a career. It does not lie within the scope of this writing to discuss the manner in which, nor the time when this defection from a broader, a nobler and a more beautiful line of life occurred. If higher purposes than any that are now universal are to find expression in man, he has passed through a period of degeneracy, the effects of which must be overcome if he shall attain not only to what has been lost, but rise above it and find his true home with God.

The history of the race, as far as we know it, and our own

* Farrar, *The Fall of Man and Other Sermons*, p. 90.

experience as members of it, our individual conflicts, aims and hopes, prove two things. The first is, that human society has not been and is not now what it ought to be. The second is, that from all the ages of men the principle of growth has not been absent. To whatsoever degree we may be amazed in this century of wonders, at the many puerile things of the past, the devastation, the superstition, the infantile dreams that entered into its activities, many of which are still with us, we must see that the idea of the good, the true and the beautiful slowly—for so deep is the degeneracy, so wide the defection—has been incorporating itself in mankind. However great may be the weight of these false notions and the monumental ignorance of the larger portion of the race; however depressing the erroneous views born of barbarism and paganism, the trend of history, though apparently checked and dissipated at times by overshadowing events which struck the world dumb with darkness, has been onward and upward, away from the narrow domain of bondage, in the direction of liberty in all the elements that enter into human life. Scarcely a century passed by but some link was broken, some shackle was hurled aside, some eye was opened. Like the fabled Leviathan rising from the sea and shaking the earth with the majesty of his tread, man comes forth from the floods of time, and under the guidance of the Logos in history, gradually grows into the knowledge of his dignity,* and becomes conscious of an eternal spiritual purpose.

There are two elements in which, and two lines of life along which this growth has been and will continue to be made, touching the real needs of man and the march of destiny. These are religion and civil government, or the conditions of organized society.

We place the element of religion first, because in point of time it is the older, and in importance the greater. Religion has so intimate a connection with human life that by it one can determine both the character and degree of civilization and culture which have been attained by individuals, a school of

*John iii. 16.

teachers or a nation. It influences every important art, as well as all the relations of private and social intercourse. In its full development it holds everything else in subordination to itself. As its birth dates back to human beginnings, so is the consummation of destiny inseparably connected with it. We do not speak of religion in an arbitrary sense, meaning thereby a certain code of philosophical precepts, or some one system of dogmas. The word as here used refers to that instinct in human nature which in any form and in any degree whatsoever, from the most degraded Fetishism to the highest type of spirituality in the Kingdom of Grace, involuntarily, by force of circumstances or through divine intervention, asserts the existence of the supernatural. Thus it includes not only beliefs, but practices; not only spiritual capacity and wants, but also every kind of effort made to cultivate and satisfy these.

I.

The Orient is the birth-place of religion. There where man first began to live, he also first began to worship. Leaving out of account for the present the sacred books of the Jews, the history of religions tells us that the earliest forms of worship common among the Gentile nations, not excepting even the Egyptians, were rude and simple, and consisted chiefly of sacrifices and prayers addressed to mysterious powers believed to be embodied in the objects of nature. "Now it must be that many of the qualities which objects of the material world in primitive times were thought to possess, had been reflected back upon them from the feelings which those objects stirred in the beholder. The high thing was endowed with moral qualities, because looking upward aroused some moral thoughts. In truth it would seem that the great fetish gods of the early world were three, and three only—the tree, the mountain and the river. Lesser fetishes take their holiness from the greater—the stone from the mountain, the branch or the block of wood from the tree. But such lesser fetishes were not worshiped in the prime of fetishism. They are simply survivals. The difference be-

tween early fetishism and late superstition is only in name. The Portuguese sailor prays to his fetish—the word is of Spanish origin—to save him from shipwreck, because he believes that he is somehow thus influencing an unseen Being who has power over the winds and the waves.* The African, too, has a notion of such an Unseen Being when he prays to his gri-gri to save him from the storm. Had he no such notion, he would pray to the winds and waves themselves not to drown him.”†

Though we cannot with our enlightenment obtain a realizing sense of the spiritual condition of these primitive people, we can readily see that it must have been extremely limited and of a very low order. The state of language, of manners and customs was also commensurate with it. That period can be called the poetic age and may be compared to the innocence and prattling inexperience of childhood. But it is a sad and humble picture to gaze upon, while there ring in our ears traditions that have come down from dim antiquity, traditions of a Golden Age when man walked with God and evil was a theory; when instead of groping about in the recesses of deep dark caverns for but one ray of light, he stood on the mountain tops of being and cast a long satisfying look into the radiance of eternity; when he asked no questions, but simply communed face to face with the All-Father. It is a sad picture! It was a sadder state! But with it began the trend of history.

To this day the veneration of animals is practiced in India. This form of worship stands next in order to Fetishism and is the result of experience, and rather a compromise than a creation. In process of time, when men were once taught to distinguish between the talisman and its bearer, mysterious powers and their prophets, by the discovery of foibles, weaknesses and deceptions, they had recourse to another means for the purpose

* The Chinese sailors when about to make a voyage, go to their priests and purchase written prayers which are believed to be efficacious in procuring deliverance from danger. The writer possesses such a talisman or fetish, which was found by a friend on a street in San Francisco, where it had evidently been lost by its owner.

† Keary, *Primitive Belief*, p. 35.

of appeasing the religious instinct.* The animals which surrounded them, both those that had been domesticated and those that ran wild in the forests and inhabited the streams, were deified. It was impossible to fathom the mystery of their being. They gave no sign by which their inner life could be read. It was but natural that a broken faith should recrystallize itself around these mute denizens of the lower world—the dog, the horse, the bird, the elephant, the tiger, the ape, the crocodile and the serpent. Moreover, this form of religion received a new impulse from Pythagoras, who under a modified phase, assigned it a place in his philosophy, when he enunciated the doctrine of the transmigration of souls.

Out of the worship of the phenomena of nature, after the tree Yggdrasyl or Ohdinn's ash, the Haoma of the Mazdeans, the Soma of the Hindu Aryans and the amritam—ambrosia—extracted from its leaves, had become historic as objects of veneration, grew the polytheism which is more or less characteristic of all the religions of antiquity, including the beliefs of the Germanic tribes of a later day.† Henotheism, a word coined by Max Mueller, describes that form of religion in which the fetish-worshiper adored the powers of nature—any elemental display—while in action, and forgot them when that ceased, making no distinction between the prayers addressed to the whirlwind, the storm or the thunder-cloud. In Polytheism these powers are personified and receive a permanent form. The mountains are made the habitation of gods possessing the attributes of men, their emotions, their purposes, a strength like, but surpassing theirs and exercised through the mystic gift of magic. The forests are peopled with fauns, satyrs and fairies; the rivers and seas with nymphs, dryads and mermaids. In the storm Cyclops, the Chimera and furies sweep the earth with devastation. In the dawn Demeter, the earth-mother, at regular intervals pours out her favor upon mankind.

Among the Greeks and Romans polytheism reached its

* Lotze, *Mikrokosmos*, Vol. III. p. 339.

* Lenormant, *Beginnings of History*, p. 88.

climax. Every family had its household divinity. The acts of private life were controlled by its spirit. All the utensils of labor and trade were dedicated to the Penates. Important plans were undertaken only after consultation of the oracles. The massive and beautiful temples of the ideal Greeks and the war-like Romans, owed their erection to the influence of this highly imaginative faith. The conception of one, true and living God, the Maker of heaven and earth, was as little present here as in preceding ages. No wonder that the words of Saint Paul on Mars' Hill: "Whom therefore ye ignorantly worship, him declare I unto you"—excited doubt, contempt and animosity in his pagan listeners.* With a single heroic utterance he put to shame those idle fancies, those "gods many and lords many," and, without disturbing their architectural beauty, swept away the false religious foundation of their temples.

Polytheism in its Grecian type, despite the lack of a pure moral ideal and the knowledge of a universal Divine Essence—apart from the speculations of a few great philosophers—presents an example of an unparalleled development in this direction. Aside from the dearth of true spirituality, which more enlightened minds must deplore, there is a captivating charm about this ancient mythology. Owing in part to this and in part to his hatred of the Nazarene, even after Constantine had declared Christianity imperial, Julian, the Apostate, made an effort to restore the worship of the gods. But their day was over. To idealize them by philosophy could not save them. "The upper classes were destitute of faith, yet terrified at skepticism. Their official religion was a decrepit Theogony; their real religion was a vague and credulous fatalism, which disbelieved in the existence of the gods, or held with Epicurus that they were careless of mankind. All men joined in the confession that the 'oracles were dumb.' It hardly needed the wail of mingled lamentations as of departing deities which swept over the astonished crew of the vessel off Palodes to

* *Acts xvii. 28.*

assure the world that the reign of the gods of Hellas was over —that ‘Great Pan was dead.’” *

Many a one who failed to grasp the all-absorbing truths of Christianity, has been led to lament the awakening of the human mind from its poetic dream during the reign of the ancient gods, as if the beautiful in nature and in man could not be cherished and immortalized in any other way. Among great men the German poet, Schiller, is a most notable example of this tendency. His writings are full of noble sentiment, imbibed in early youth at a pious mother’s knee, and by them one is taught to love the virtuous and the beautiful more deeply. But nearly all of them make one feel that Schiller lived in a by-gone age. His ideals were Grecian.

Da ihr noch die schöne Welt regiert,
An der Freude leichtem Gängelband
Glücklichere Menschenalter führtet,
Schöne Wesen aus dem Fabelland !
Ach ! da euer Wonnedienst noch glänzte,
Wie ganz anders, anders war es da !
Da man deine Tempel noch bekränzte,
Venus Amathusia !

Wo jetzt nur, wie unsere Weisen sagen,
Seelenlos ein Feuerball sich dreht,
Lenkte damals seinen goldenen Wagen
Helios in stiller Majestät.
Diese Höhen füllten Oreaden,
Eine Dryas starb mit jenem Baum,
Aus den Urnen lieblicher Najaden
Sprang der Ströme Silberschaum.

Schöne Welt, wo bist du? Kehre wieder,
Holdes blithenalter der Natur!
Ach nur in dem Feenland der Lieder
Lebt noch deine goldene Spur.
Ausgestorben trauert das Gefilde,
Keine Gottheit zeigt sich meinem Blick,
Ach ! von jenem lebenwarmen Bilde
Blieb nur das Gerippe mir zurück.

* Farrar, *Early Days of Christianity*, p. 8.

Alle jene Blüten sind entfallen
Von des Nordes winterlichem Wehn,
Einen zu bereichern, unter allen,
Musste diese Götterwelt vergehn.
Trauerig such' ich an dem Sternenbogen,
Dich, Selene, find' dich dort nicht mehr;
Durch die Wälder ruf' ich, durch die Wogen,
Ach! sie widerhallen leer!

* * * *

Da die Götter menschlicher noch waren,
Waren Menschen göttlicher.

In Egypt the religious instinct found expression in a way that differed widely from the mythology of the Greeks, though both systems of worship may have originated from similar causes. Only the Hellenes idealized the human form and the passions of the soul, whereas the ancient Egyptians sought to find in their images visible expression of the powers they saw at work around them, and of the Unseen Infinite that boundless space suggested to them. They were worshippers of the heavenly bodies, the regularity of whose movements during many dynasties impressed them with the vastness of the universe. And hence we find that the gods of Egypt were more fanciful in construction than those of Greece. In form they bordered on the monstrous, revealing the underlying idea that the less human in appearance, the nearer did they believe them to approach an adequate expression of the divine realities. The mysterious in nature, the principle of life, the passage of time, the relation of the soul to the universe as a part of it, entered more deeply into the religion of the people along the Nile and the Indus, than into that of any occidental nation of ancient times.

We have aimed to show that the change made by mankind in early ages, from Fetishism to Polytheism, did not consist merely in an elaboration of details, but that, though meager and far removed from truth, it was indicative of progress. These never did and never could of themselves develop the true conception

of God. But the passage from the one to the other is a step, though negative it may be, toward that end, for all the while men were learning something. Moses did not despise the wisdom of the Egyptians, whose priests, without disturbing the popular faith, gave birth to the science of astronomy. And Reuchlin, in the sixteenth century—the second leader of the German humanists—placed such value upon the Hebrew and the Greek languages that the valiant and victorious battle he waged in their defense against the monks, “identified the cause of the Reformation in the minds of the German youth with that of classical learning.”* And Herder, some centuries later, did not fear to say that there was but one Greece and but one Greek language, and that these never again will reappear in the history of the race.

Though we may be able to trace a degree of progress in the religions of the ancient Gentile nations, that progress in each one of them at a certain period came to a final close, because there was no possibility of a further unfolding. True spiritual enlightenment was wanting, and hence those faiths assumed a form which, with slight variation, they maintained for thousands of years. The Brahminical Reformation under Buddha is an example of such a change.†

Among all the religions of the ancient world, Judaism alone possessed and preserved the moral idea, which, acting as a leaven, superseded Paganism, and, beginning to assert itself at a time when the worship of idols in the most learned nations of antiquity had become effete, exerted that influence to which is owing all later progress on the part of mankind in the direction of religious enlightenment. “As compared with neighboring peoples in the old world, the Hebrews appear insignificant. Their country was small. The part they played on the stage of history

* Hallam, *Literature of Europe*, Vol. I, p. 299.

† “The innovation (*Neuerung*) made by Buddha was a revolution in the sphere of religion which one can with some justice compare to the relation between Christianity and Judaism, and which had an incalculable influence on the civilization of central Asia.” (Göll, *Mythology*, p. 319.)

was very humble, for they were seldom victors. And yet, through the will of destiny and a concatenation of circumstances whose causes can easily be traced, they have exercised a greater influence than any other Asiatic people. Yes, to a large degree through Christianity as well as Mohammedanism, they have become the basis of the greater part of the world's enlightenment."*

But Judaism superseded paganism only then when the Hebrews had fulfilled the positive side of their mission as a nation. Christianity adopted the sacred books of the Jews, breathed into them a new life and interpreted them with the help of a broader spirit, so that their teachings were merged into the precepts, promises and claims of the Founder of Christianity. The universality of the Roman government and an era of comparative peace gave the disciples of Christ the opportunity to carry His tenets to all parts of the then known world, and to proclaim His mission even in the isles of the sea. By and by a political phase manifested itself in the history of Christianity. Its cause was championed by Constantine the Great, who, to make himself more secure upon the throne, and to prolong the existence of the Roman Empire, sought the support of the adherents of this faith, but proved his religious insincerity and political craftiness by the numerous murders he committed, by his pretended adoption of the views of Arius and by his doubtful death. His policy, however, broadly taken, laid the foundation of the Roman Church, whose clergy at the fall of the empire obtained control of all state and municipal affairs, and maintained that control almost unchallenged for a thousand years. Whatever corruptions and abuses were developed in that communion by so long a lease of power, and however much we may condemn many practices which became prevalent, there can be no doubt that an end was accomplished by the institution of the Papacy, in the advancement of mankind, which possibly could have been attained by no other means. The political ascendancy of the Church broke certain prejudices and changed certain conditions peculiar to pagan society, which would otherwise have seriously

* Herder, *Philosophy of History*, Part III, p. 50.

hindered the progress of enlightenment. This admission is to be understood in a relative and limited sense. Notwithstanding all the abuses, the presence of the Church asserted the existence of a Divine Ruler, a divine law and an authority higher than brute force.* Despite the many glaring inconsistencies presented by her history, the scandals, the oppression of which she made herself guilty, the influence of the moral idea at the foundation of her institutions and the unity for which she contended, finally resulted in the abolition of villenage and slavery in Europe.† The Roman Church did not only support her sentiment in favor of human equality by throwing open her offices, honors and emoluments to all classes of men, irrespective of social standing, but at many a synod she legislated against the slave trade as utterly opposed to that sentiment. And under the guidance of Providence she fulfilled a mission which prepared the way in her own bosom for a higher stage of civilization in Europe. But a long period of inanity, corruption, tyranny and simony, coupled with the want of moral courage to reform these abuses, led at last to the triumph of *Christian individualism*. That equality which she had established and defended in human society, now that she proved recreant to her trust and in obedience to the will of a corrupt priesthood undertook to check the tide of time, asserted itself in the Reformation. Appeal was taken from the decrees of Rome, and the moral idea, on the banners of a new social order, again laid hold of the hearts of men. *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum!* The youth had grown into a man, and, having become conscious of his prerogatives, declared his independence. Whatever weaknesses, either from a churchly or secular point of view, Protestantism may possess, in the battle for liberty of conscience and for a closer harmony with the spiritual models of the New Testament, as against the assumptions of ecclesiasticism, its cause and spirit are far in advance of Roman Catholicism. It must be granted that the sectarian tendencies and segmentation which have been

* Guizot, *History of Civilization*, Vol. I, p. 54.

† Macaulay, *History of England*, Vol. I, p. 14.

developed by the former do not meet the purpose of Christ touching the unity of His Church. But we may look away from this unhappy condition in the great families of the Reformation; away from the determined counter-array of the two vast hosts, Protestant and Roman, which was without doubt brought about for some wise purpose known to God, and may rest our eyes upon the rich foreshowings of the future, as we trustfully await the fulfillment of the Master's glorious promise, that there shall be one fold and one shepherd.*

II.

That the trend of mankind makes for the ideal and that the destiny of the race lies in that realm, is also proved by the growth of civil government. Since the most of us live more for the present than either in the past or in the future, excepting as things done or things hoped for touch our own selfish interests, we do not appreciate the magnitude of the changes which have been wrought in political ideas and in the constitution of human society. Neither do we weigh the importance of the questions that have been and that will be solved in connection with the progress of civil government. In discussing the labor problem, the race question, the threatened tyranny of the many, followed by the reverse of the social order, a leap from one extreme to the other, in which the bourgeois, the rabble, will be on top, and nature's noblemen at the bottom, we forget former conditions. How humble were the beginnings of society! Through how many phases has it passed! How checkered has been its career! It has taken centuries to achieve the measure of liberty which men now enjoy. For hundreds, perhaps thousands, of years after the earliest manifestation of government around the family altar, erected to the household deity, had disappeared, the patriarchal form of society existed, and nomadic tribes, ruled by chiefs, contended against one another for the spoils of victory. With the building of cities and the birth of industries, provincial monarchies made their advent,

*John x. 16.

and the principle of hereditary rule and arbitrary right held sway from the days of Nebuchadnezzar, Solon and Lycurgus, Romulus and Remus, down to the time when Napoleon, intoxicated with the idea of universal power, threatened all Europe with his sceptre. Sometimes the scene was varied with the founding of an aristocracy or an oligarchy. Men did not then speak of states, but of empires, and the people were the property of kings and lived at the mercy of their rulers. When regicides occurred, they were usually instigated by members of the royal family, by the jealousy of the legions, or the ambition of the nobility. The Democracies of Greece, one of the few attempts in ancient times to establish popular government, defeated their own purpose. "In their most prosperous and palmy times they (the Greeks) were always complaining; discord and hatred prevailed between all the cities without, and in every separate city within. They gave laws to the old Romans, who before that time had none; but their own were so bad for themselves that they were continually changing them. What could be said in favor of a government under which the just Aristides was banished, Phocion put to death, Socrates condemned to drink hemlock after having been exposed to banter and derision on the stage by Aristophanes, and under which the Amphycions, with contemptible imbecility, actually delivered up Greece into the power of Philip, because the Phocians had ploughed up a field which was part of the territory of Apollo?" *

And yet the Hellenic people, who destroyed themselves by their political follies, taught after ages most valuable lessons in polity. Aristotle is the father of the science of government, and enunciated many principles which mankind were slow to grasp, but which in a younger day have exercised a regenerating influence upon society.

The Roman government, but when it was too late, when imperial power could no longer maintain the bond which had been established between the cities of different dependencies,

* Voltaire, *Philosophical Dictionary*, p. 392.

for the people of that empire lived in cities, and rural life, excepting in their immediate neighborhood, was unknown; when the barbarians with their repeated incursions threatened to subvert her martial dominion, undertook the plan of founding a confederacy. There is in existence a rescript of the emperors Honorius and Theodosius the Younger, addressed to Agricoli, Prefect of the Gauls, in the fifth century, discussing the advisability of introducing a new, an important, a defensive feature into the government, that of permitting deputies or delegates to be sent to the halls of state to represent the interests of their several localities.* But a variety of causes, the weakened condition of the empire on the one hand, and the growing hatred of its yoke on the other, among the people in the provinces, contributed to the defeat of the plan. Both the republic and the empire contained elements that wrought their ruin. As in the Greek democracies, so here, the disposition, the social condition, both of the governing and the governed classes, despite some very wise laws, led to disintegration and left the world free for the formation of new governments. Though it is a mooted question how far the Roman law influenced the people who were delivered from its positive authority at the fall of the Empire, and how much of it has been retained to this day by the leading nations of Europe, the Roman municipal system, the manner of regulating the affairs of cities, introduced by that government, has never been lost. Thus, after the lapse of centuries, we find the modern world related, as if by kinship, to the institutions of the Cæsars.

What were the conditions of society, which proved to be insurmountable obstacles to the ancient governments of Europe, during their sway, and when, by artificial stimulation, they sought to maintain their perpetuity? They were in the main the same that now exist in India and China. Gross ignorance and rudeness did not alone characterize the masses in those ages, but society itself was such that liberty could not at all, or only to an insignificant degree, be made the boon and possession

* Guizot, *History Civilization*, Vol. I., p. 45.

of the people, who had been born and bred the victims of distorted and tyrannical circumstances. It was the lack of civil equality; it was serfdom, slavery, the disgrace imputed to labor, which stood in the way of progress, which was held there by the unholy power of a traditional custom as old as the selling of Joseph into Egypt.

The Christian religion was in existence five hundred years before any perceptible change occurred in the disposition of mankind. Though outward forms of life were Christian, the institutions of society still preserved their pagan identity. In the fifth century, just before the fall of the Roman Empire, labor began to liberate itself. Prior to that time the different trades were followed by slaves. Just how or when this new departure occurred is not known. But the appearance of free artisans at the close of the Roman civilization was indicative of improvement in the social condition of the masses, even though it met with serious embarrassment, and in some parts of Europe was wholly obliterated again during the unproductive, unprogressive centuries of the Middle Ages and the feudal system, when the modern nations of Europe were slowly but surely crystallizing into being, out of the wreck of the Roman law and the institutions of Charlemagne.

The Feudal system was an anomaly in the history of European civilization. Squatter sovereignty on this continent before the War of the Rebellion, bore some resemblance to it. But to feudalism is owing the social elevation of woman. We do not deny that the Christian religion from its very birth, as far as its teachings are concerned, contended for the liberation of the female portion of mankind. Nevertheless, it sought the souls of men first, and for the rest taught them to submit to existing orders; to watch and to pray until the cloud should break and the kingdom of heaven should find recognition on earth. It adapted itself to circumstances, often only too much so, and worked as a leaven. However, we saw that society, though outwardly Christian, was inwardly pagan. When once the feudal castle led to the discovery of the true worth and office of

woman, the religion of Christ could attach itself to knight-errantry, since the valorous crusader bore upon his breast-plate the symbol of the cross, and in his heart the image of a noble woman; could infuse itself into the songs of the Minnesingers, and prepare the way for the Christian home of modern society.

Some historians describe the Crusades as supreme follies, perpetrated by a fanatic and credulous age. We may deplore the fact that the followers of Peter the Hermit, numbering two hundred and twenty-five thousand men, unorganized, unaccoutréed, accompanied by but four horses, and preceded by a goat and a goose, should attempt so prodigious an undertaking as the conquest of Jerusalem. We may view with pity the results of a journey that not only ended disastrously in a military sense, but whitened the road "leading through Hungary to the East" with a long line of ghastly bones, yet the truth remains that the Crusades aroused Europe from its lethargy, and by bringing its people into contact with oriental civilization, created the renaissance and led to the Revival of Learning.

If we ask what, from this time on, caused the amazing gain in the momentum of occidental civilization, and has made the last four hundred years, with all the bloodshed they chronicle, with a Philip of Spain, a Margaret of Parma, a Richelieu, a Marat, and a Robespierre, the most productive, the noblest in sixty centuries,—the answer is at once at hand. It was the influence of letters. It was the birth of science. The awakening of the human mind in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, resulted in the establishment of universities and schools all over Europe. "As its first vernal influences chased away the cold mists of ignorance and superstition, a thousand intellects sprang into freedom, and a thousand utterances burst into eloquence and song." It is no idle tale to say that the literary treasures of the past gave energy to a whole continent, and redeemed the stagnation of a thousand years.

Superstition, it seems, is an impediment to social progress which lingers longest on the earth. What tyrants are to the body, it is to the soul of man. They can destroy the former

without touching the spiritual entity. But superstition, like sin, seizes, chokes and devours the best there is in life, conscience and character, happiness and peace. But the physicists, whatever other proud and inconsequential boasts they may make, have given it a staggering blow, under which it is reeling toward the abyss from whence it sprang.

Let us pause now and contemplate the achievements of the centuries!

In the wake of the destruction of slavery and the elevation of woman in the western part of Europe, the Revival of Learning and the Reformation, has followed the establishment of constitutional government in England and Italy, in Germany and France, in Brazil and Japan. Since 1848 Grecian soil has been free, and Athens, once the glory of the Hellenic Isles, but which in 1832 could boast of only a few new wooden houses, one or two more solid structures and a bazaar composed of sheds, has in fifty years grown into a city of 50,000 inhabitants, the Piraeus numbering 80,000 more. And in expenditures for educational interests, the government of which it is the capital leads the van among the nations of the globe. "What a change, when we consider that fifty years ago not a book could be bought in Athens!"*

And in the forefront of this vast array stands a civilization which, though the youngest, is not only the peer, but the superior of any in the wide, wide world.

My country, 'tis of thee,
Sweet land of liberty,
Of thee I sing:
Land where my fathers died,
Land of the pilgrims' pride,
From every mountain side
Let freedom ring!

My native country, thee—
Land of the noble free—
Thy name I love:
I love thy rocks and rills,

* Timayenis, *History of Greece*, Vol. II, p. 412.

Thy woods and templed hills,
My heart with rapture thrills
Like that above.

Our fathers' God, to Thee,
Author of liberty,
To Thee we sing;
Long may our land be bright
With freedom's holy light;
Protect us with Thy might,
Great God, our King!

These institutions of ours were dearly bought, and the blood of many within the memory of men still living was spilled to maintain them. Some evils which afflicted us have been dissipated. Under God we will uproot the remaining ones. Nevertheless, we do not stand afar off, as did Moses on Nebo, yearning after a taste of freedom, for we already enjoy its energies and its blessings. With our own eyes we see what Christianity, enlightenment and liberty do; aye, what they will do. Education and free industry have given us our society. Science has taught us that the forests, the mountain-tops and the seas are not inhabited by spectral divinities. It has driven witchcraft from the land and dispelled the degrading faith in omens. It has broadened the mind to receive the sublime fact that the material universe is one great organic whole, under the control of absolute law. Thus is repeated, in the Occident, divested of the mysteries of idolatry, the conception of the East. Here lies the limit of physical science. But the Christian sees in this universal law an expression of the Will of the Ancient of Days, and fleeing the superstitions of the past and proclaiming the healing promises of the Master, with head erect and heart unbound, pursues his course into the future. This is the spirit, these are the elements of our civilization. They contain somewhat of the ideal,—the true, the beautiful and the good.

We stand in the dawn, and its golden rays cast a prophetic light upon us. Our civilization touches one shore of the Pacific

Main. Along the other lie the countries in which man began his existence. The trend of history is onward. The power that makes for righteousness will encircle the globe, and establish a confederation of the world. When that comes to pass, this will in truth be the outer-court of the Temple not made with hands, eternal in the heavens. And the regenerate nations, rushing beneath the lifted veil into the Gardens Beautiful, will find their destiny before the Face of the All-Father, and an unending bliss in the harmonies of the City that hath Foundation.

V.

PERSONAL CONSECRATION TO CHRIST.

BY REV. J. G. NOSS.

THERE are two prerequisite conditions in order to personal consecration to Christ. The first of these is *oneness* with Him. Devotion to any being from another, in any sphere, is possible only on the basis of their oneness; and the nature of the oneness determines the character of such devotion. The lowest form of devotion in the sphere of nature is grounded, of course, on the basis of the animal life. One animal can be devoted to another, not only of its own species, but even to one of different instincts and disposition, because of the common basis between them in the animal nature. On the same ground also can an animal be devoted to a human being. But an animal cannot in the same way be devoted to a stone or a tree on the one hand, nor to anything beyond the sphere of the physical on the other. A dog may lay down his life for his master, while living, or pine to death over his grave when dead, but such devotion, both subjectively and objectively can have as its basis only the *sarx*, for here only is there oneness between the two. The dog cannot be devoted to any intellectual or moral attribute in the master, for want of a common basis; and such devotion, therefore, can have no moral quality. The master may be grossly ignorant and immoral, or the opposite, the devotion is the same.

Where the *psyche* and the *sarx* together constitute the basis, as in the human being, there may be devotion in three directions: to the animal, to a fellow-human being, and, not to God, but to that which the merely psychical man can know of God. Man's devotion to the animal can only be partial and limited

because the basis between them is only common in part. There is no ground present in the animal upon which all the human psychical forces can be fully, freely and responsively exercised. Man's devotion to his fellow-man can be full, free and relatively perfect, for however individuals may differ in body and soul as to particular qualities, the common basis between them is such as to afford scope for the exercise of all the sacerdical and psychical affections of one person for another. When the common basis between them is impaired by the death of one or the other, neither the corpse nor the disembodied soul can continue to satisfy the demands of the devotion of the living one; just as neither the corpse nor the disembodied soul could ever have called such devotion into activity. Devotion to the loved one is now only a devotion to the image retained in the memory. The present separation cannot be reconciled with the oneness of the past, for the basis of the oneness between man and man is not in the body, nor in the soul, as such, but in the union of both.

God is a Spirit, and as such the merely psychical man cannot be devoted to Him, and cannot even know Him. The psychical man is indeed the creation and the image of God, and in one sense also His offspring, but is not truly one with Him because there is no common essential basis between the created Psyche and the uncreated Pneuma. The psychical man standing between the lower creation and God, is fully one with neither, and yet a promise and a prophecy all the while of something higher and better to come. His position is meaningless as a finality. So also the animal creation pointed to something higher than itself as its true meaning in the sphere of life. With all the possibilities of the human soul the chasm between it and the eternal Godhead is too great for man to comprehend Him, to come into close communion with Him, or to consecrate himself to Him. He may indeed by contemplating himself and the creation around him know that there is a God, for "that which may be known of God is manifest in them . . . even his eternal power and Godhead;" but man cannot by searching find Him

out, nor by wisdom know Him. There was no common basis on which the infinite God and finite man could hold full communion together, even independent of sin, and hence man in all ages of the world constantly attempted to establish such a basis either by the personification of the wisdom, goodness and power of God in the natural creation, or by the apotheosis of sages and heroes. In both cases there was an unconscious effort to bring into harmony on a common basis the superhuman and the human, the infinite and the finite. Even where there was a belief in original deities, the fathers of the gods, like *Il* of the Chaldeans, or *Uranus* of the Greeks, these gods had to give way in honor and adoration to those who were less august, but came nearer to the basis of the human as the personifications of the particular objects and forces in nature. Even the Jews, with all their training, found in their Jehovah a God mighty and terrible, from whom they were prone to shrink and to take refuge in the worship of the more human-like gods of the nations. The law of that Jehovah was a burden they could not bear, for instead of establishing a common basis, and thus making peace, each additional revelation of His will only made more manifest the greatness of His holiness and the depth of the sins of His people, until the heart in anguish cried out: "Oh that Thou wouldest rend the heavens, that Thou wouldest come down." Every hope of reconciliation was centered in the coming Seed, the anointed of the Lord.

"When the fulness of the time came, God sent forth His Son, made of a woman, made under the law, to redeem them that were under the law, that we might receive the adoption of sons. And because ye are sons, God hath sent forth the Spirit of His Son into your hearts, crying, Abba, Father." What a marvellous change is expressed by this language! What a reconciliation between those who seemed so far apart, and what a oneness between those who were so different! This reconciliation and oneness have their basis, of course, in Christ, the incarnate Son of God. "The Word was made flesh, and dwelt among us." This was not only evidence that God and man

could become one, but was also one of the constituents of that oneness. The divine and human becoming one in the person of Christ, did not, however, in itself make other individuals one with God. The Son of God appearing in the likeness of sinful flesh was a mystery to man. Flesh and blood could not recognize Him, and the merely psychical man could not understand the spiritual and heavenly things which He spake. Christ being one with the Father as well as with humanity, did the works of the Father, and spake the things of the Father in human form and human speech. The disciples, together with the others who saw and heard Him, having only the basis of the human could properly interpret neither His works nor His doctrine. The other constituent of man's oneness with God was still wanting. As "no man knoweth the things of a man save the spirit of man that is in him, even so the things of God knoweth no man, but the Spirit of God." And until the work of redemption was completed in the death and resurrection of Christ, and the true meaning of the incarnation of the Son of God was made manifest in His exaltation above all angels, and in the mystery of Pentecost, His disciples could only helplessly tarry in Jerusalem and wait for the promised coming of the Holy Ghost. By His coming into man the oneness between God and man was fully actualized. In the Incarnation God was made man; in the gift of the Holy Ghost man was made partaker of the divine nature. Henceforth the disciple of Christ is not simply a learner, on the psychical basis, of the things taught him by the Saviour; but by the indwelling Spirit he has become *pneumatikos*, and, as such, he can now discern that which was unknowable to him on the lower basis. In the possession of the Spirit of Christ he is far more really one with the now invisible Christ than he was when he had daily personal intercourse with Him in the flesh. The *Pneuma* in him ennobles the *psyche* and *sarx*, just as the incoming of the *psyche* ennobled the *sarx* in the first creation. He is a new being now, not by creation, but by birth; having still the same personality, indeed, but that personality no longer centred in the old nature of the

dead Adam, but in the new divine-human which is forever present in the glorified God-man, the Head of the new race. And such oneness with Christ is the first essential condition upon which alone there can be personal consecration to Him. Here only have we the basis of a new heavenly *gnosis*: "I know mine own, and mine own know Me, even as the Father knoweth Me, and I know the Father." Here alone have we the basis of a new heaven-born *agápe*: "As the Father hath loved Me, I also have loved you; abide ye in my love. If ye keep my commandments, ye shall abide in my love; even as I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in His love." And here also we have the only basis for our participation in the newly-revealed divine *zoé*: "And the witness is this, that God gave unto us eternal life, and this life is in His Son." And this new *gnosis*, *agápe* and *zoé* demand from us altogether a new *bios*, or living in the world, a living in Christ and for Christ.

When we come to consider the practical bearing of all this upon the question before us, we cannot help but realize that the constant consciousness of our oneness with Christ is that without which any professed consecration to Him is vain. Here, at least, theory dare not be one thing and practice another, and there must be no divorce between what ought to be and what is. If the Saviour Himself could say: "I can of mine own self do nothing," how much more truly does He also say of us: "Without Me ye can do nothing"! If Christ in us be the Rock on which the Church is reared, the consciousness of this fact can alone give us that source of strength without which we are but weaklings. "I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me," must still be the constant thought of every earnest Christian. Peter and John standing before the rulers and elders of the Jews at Jerusalem, though appearing to them unlettered and ignorant men, were bold as kings with the consciousness that they were exercising supreme authority and power in making known unto them the great Corner-Stone so recently rejected by these foolish builders.

And it is significantly added that they took knowledge of them that they had been with Jesus, who ever taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes. The fact is not to be lost sight of here that these same apostles, when they could see Jesus of Nazareth only as a teacher from without, and be loyal to Him merely on the basis of the psychical, but a short time before manifested a cowardly fear for their own safety, when they saw the Master in the power of these same rulers. But how every sarcic and psychic consideration is now suppressed by the overmastering power of the spiritual forces within them, and how God-like they appear in the consciousness that, through the indwelling Spirit, they are one with the glorified God-man! How overwhelming is the heaven-born conviction that they are speaking to men in God's stead!

This consciousness must also always carry with it the same forceful sense of power, for Christ is the same yesterday, to-day and forever. And if those who undertake to teach in His name do not speak as the oracles of God, it is evidence that there is wanting in them the principal condition of consecration to Christ. And whatever be the calling in life of any true Christian, he must necessarily carry with him in all his words and works a power and authority that spring from a source far higher than that which is simply human. A weak Christian is a sick Christian. This consciousness of oneness with Christ is the only basis also on which the martyr-spirit can firmly rest. For he alone in whom Christ is can show the faithfulness which is Christ-like, whether before the praise or condemnation of men. Fealty to Christ on any lower basis than this is always sure to break down in seasons of persecution, or under strong temptation of any kind. To be able to see victory on the cross, triumph at the stake, and gain in death, are conceptions not born of flesh and blood.

It were strange, however, if, in this age, in which the god of material and physical forces is so generally worshipped by the world, the Church should abstain entirely from paying homage at his shrines. That "the race is not to the swift, nor the battle

to the strong," is a truth we all accept; Napoleon's dictum that "God is on the side of the strong battalions," is an error we all reject; and yet in practice it is not the world alone that is influenced by this Napoleonic faith. "Money speaks," "Numbers count," and "Nothing succeeds like success," are the coined expressions deemed of great value in our day, and which too often pass as current shekels in the Temple of God. Is it not becoming almost the rule rather than the exception, even in the Church, that the man of wealth is told, "Sit thou here in a good place," and to the man poor in purse and clothing, "Stand thou there"? That the worth of a man's opinion is estimated by the number of his adherents, and that merely outward success makes amends for the questionable and often vicious methods employed in obtaining it? Judged by such standards our Saviour's own mission in the world was without strength and with insignificant results. But in no sayings of His is His sublime character more clearly shown than when He, who as the Son of Man did not shun human sympathy, and at times even craved it, in the shadow of His agony in the Garden, of His betrayal by Judas, and of His desertion by the eleven, uttered with unfathomable pathos, yet with divine repose, the words: "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is now come, that ye shall be scattered, every man to his own, and shall leave me alone; and yet I am not alone, because the Father is with me." Such a consciousness ministers a strength and consolation which legions of angels and myriads of men cannot give, and which neither the treachery nor the hostility of men can weaken. Only when the murmurless Lamb of God tasted the ultimate bitterness of death, which is conscious separation from God, was the cry as almost of despair wrung from His soul, "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" "If God be for us, who can be against us?" And whether it be the intrepid Elijah on Mt. Carmel, Athanasius against the world, or some lone man of God to-day, who realizes this, there are no hostile powers, human or angelic, that can rob him of his conscious superiority.

But not only does our strength depend upon our oneness with

God, but our efficiency as well. Here the Church of our day is also largely influenced by the methods which are found efficient in merely human interests. Individuals as individuals are seen to be comparatively inefficient even in their greatest activities. Hence the combination of individuals in every direction for the promotion of their own interests. Men of wealth combine their capital, not so much for the public good, as for the protection and increase of their own possessions. The nearer they can come to a monopoly of their particular enterprise, the more efficacious becomes the combination. The same is true of labor unions, trade unions, etc. The more extensive the combination the more effective it becomes for the individuals; and such effective force does not rest so much in the moral quality of the individuals, as in their numerical strength. It is not strange that those members of the Church of Christ who desire to see immediate and tangible results in their activity should copy these methods of the world. And hence we have associations many and methods many for the promotion of greater efficiency in Christian work in the world, and for greater consecration to Christ. But such supposed means for greater efficiency, whether in the world or the Church, rest upon a false conception. In union there is indeed strength, but whether that strength be effective for good or evil depends upon the nature of the union. True union, both in humanity and Christianity, is not grounded primarily in the relation of the individuals to each other, just as the union between the branches of a tree is not grounded in their relation to each other; for that relation itself is determined by the one organic life of the tree in which the true union rests. To tie some of the branches of a tree together into a bundle and call that a union, is not only to do violence to their true union, but to make the branches themselves less effective by such mechanical combination. So also the labor unions, trade unions, etc., cannot, in the end, be effectual in the direction of their own best interests, much less those of the nation or humanity, because they ignore the true union in both. That is always a selfish, and even suicidal principle.

at bottom which first divorces the general from the particular good, and then identifies the particular good with individual self-interest.

This same truth holds in the sphere of Christianity. The only union that can be effective here is union with Christ, as it is also the true ground of personal consecration to Christ, as we have seen. "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one Body." And this oneness with Christ through the Spirit, and, as such, our oneness with each other, is the only true basis on which there can be any effective Christian activity. The powers which constituted the Holy Catholic Church in the days of the apostles were then, and have been ever since, the only efficient means by which that Church has been extended among men. The Church is a spiritual organization. The external and visible things of this organization are indeed necessary, but are to be regarded only as the means through which the heavenly forces back of them are effective. It is not the language form of the word that is effective, but the spirit and life back of it. So it is also not the outward association of Christians that makes them or their work effective. The genuine inspiration of the Christian assembly does not come from the fact of the association of a certain class of individual Christians, nor yet from the fact that we stand together in the assembly of Rome, Heidelberg, or Westminster, but in the fact that we "are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, . . . to the general assembly and church of the first-born who are enrolled in heaven." And he who is always conscious of his oneness with the Holy Catholic Church is vastly more effective in his Christian activity than is he whose denominational or associational consciousness predominates over that. It is far wiser to turn our activity toward a realization of the true union that is, than towards that which is but a simulation of the true; and in order to realize this union it is infinitely better to have full faith in what Christ has done for us, and what He is in us, than what we can do for Him. The one is the faith of Simon, son of Jonas, the other that of Peter,

the apostle of our Lord. If denominationalism has marred the true union of the Church, the healing surely cannot be effected by any such *similia similibus* remedies as are at hand in our modern associations, whether denominational, interdenominational or undenominational.

The other prerequisite condition of personal consecration to Christ is the consciousness of our difference from Him. Here also the difference between the Father and the Son during the state of humiliation of the Son, enables us to understand how the difference between Christ and the Christian constitutes a condition of such consecration. In every respect in which our Saviour could say, "My Father is greater than I," we find the measure of the condition in which He could consecrate Himself to the Father. His oneness with the Father constituted the internal, and His difference from Him the external condition of such consecration. "He emptied Himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man He humbled Himself, becoming obedient even unto death." In this comprehensive statement we have a true delineation of our Saviour's life on earth. His self-limitation carried with it such a difference between Him and the Father as did not exist in the world of glory from which He descended into this world. The "form," "likeness," and "fashion," were not merely external appearances, but they are the expression of a real, internal, personal *status*, by which alone His obedience to the will of the Father could have any such moral value as to merit the exaltation which follows: "Wherefore God also highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name." We can conceive the *kenosis* to have been a single act, but the obedience, to be real, must have been accomplished, during the whole period of His humiliation, under the constant consciousness not simply of the possibility, but of the temptation not to obey the will of the Father. For He was in all points tempted like as we are, and these temptations were as real as ours. His night-long prayers were real wrestlings with the Father, because of His conscious-

need of His continual help; and His full personal consecration to Him was the result of a constant struggle to realize the perfect life demanded by His relation to the Father.

The same truth holds between Christ and the Christian. If the consciousness of our oneness with Him makes us stronger than kings, the consciousness of our difference from Him and inferiority to Him makes us, or ought to make us, the humblest and meekest beings on earth. Neither does this difference involve any contradiction to our oneness with Him, for such difference is not outside of Him, but in Him. He is the Head, we are the members; He is the Master, we the disciples; He is the Lord, we the servants; but all this on the basis of one common life. The fact that the Father was in the Son established in the God-man such an ideal for His living on earth that the constant consciousness of that ideal made Him the meek and lowly Being that He was. Even He did not measure Himself by Himself, much less by the measure of men. So Christ in us is the ideal standard for our living in the world. The more we know of Christ, and the greater the consciousness of our oneness with Him is, the deeper also will be the consciousness of our shortcomings and imperfections; the greater the knowledge of our want of conformity to the image within us, and the stronger the desire to reach after such conformity. If the weak Christian is a sick Christian, the self-sufficient Christian is a dying Christian. Here is the basis of the Pauline paradox, which to the psychical man must ever be foolishness: "When I am weak then I am strong."

But in our difference from Christ lies the possibility and danger of our going astray. In our want of perfect apprehension lies the danger of misapprehension, and in our incapability of perfect obedience lies the danger of disobedience. In order to personal consecration to Christ it is demanded that every endowment and acquirement of spirit, soul and body be brought into subjection to Him, and that in all our growing "we grow up into Him in all things, which is the Head." Necessity is laid upon us ever to strive to reach the ideal: "Be ye there-

fore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect." Woe be to us if we forget this standard, and measure ourselves by ourselves. The inspiration to such a living cannot come from numbers, not from any merely psychical forces whatever, nor yet from any subjectively worked-up enthusiasm. The calm conscious power flowing from our oneness with Christ, and the strong impulses resulting from an ever present Spirit-wrought desire to be more and more Christ-like in all our doings, cannot fail to carry with them a constantly growing consecration to Christ, and our living, short as it may come of the true ideal, shall not be in vain.

The great danger in our day is that the consciousness of our oneness with, and therefore also of our difference from, Christ does not keep pace with the supposed increase in our apprehension of the revelation of Christ. The so-called advanced theology is not afflicted with modesty. We feel strong where we should feel weak; for our strength is in Christ, and not in our apprehension of His revelation, even though such apprehension be true. That assumed wisdom and philosophy which "puff up" are, however, to be discredited. If they are not wise who believe that wisdom and virtue perished with the ancients, and that we in our day have inherited only their ignorance and vices, they certainly are not sages who believe that we have added a hundredfold to their wisdom and virtue, and have inherited none of their ignorance and but few of their vices. The optimism in the one case is worse than the pessimism in the other; for the knowledge of one's shortcomings furnishes at least an essential condition for improvement, while the absence of it excludes it. If Paul was taught that his thorn in the flesh was needful for him lest he should be exalted overmuch, because of the exceeding greatness of the revelations vouchsafed to him in the glorious light of the third heaven, there should be at least the shadow of suspicion upon those who glory in the rush-light illumination of their own *Vorstellungen* rather than in the weakness in which the strength of Christ is made perfect.

There is yet another direction in which our subject, it may

be thought, should demand consideration—in that of our consecration to Christ in the persons of our fellow-Christians, and in our devotion to His will with reference to them that are without. But it is hardly necessary to remark that this is included in what has already been said. If our consecration to Christ in our twofold relation to Him be sincere, there can be no further question concerning our faithfulness in other directions; for he who is true to God cannot be faithless to men, whether they are within or without the Church. The consecration of the Son to the Father made Him what He was to men, and the consecration by the Apostles to Christ made them what they were to men. And this is true still, although there are not a few in our day who reverse this order, by making outward zeal and activity the measure of consecration to Christ. The insistence upon outward uniformity of service betrays not only a narrow, but a false conception of true consecration to Christ. The tree is indeed known by its fruit, but it is not required that that fruit should always be peaches. It is quality, not uniformity in kind, that is wanted. Gifts differ, but the basis of the stewardship is the same, and it is required that each steward be faithful to Christ whatever the entrusted talents may be. One minister may have unbounded faith in the power of Christ in Him, and in the efficacy of His Word and Sacraments, and at the same time be humble, retiring and unselfish, not seeking to please men, but to be more and more true to the perfect ideal within him. Another may have implicit confidence in himself, seeking the praise of men, coveting the high places, striking hands with all kinds of men in his pursuit of self-sought honor, and having more faith in the rhetoric of his sermons than in the divine power of the Word. He may be like a comet that may attract for a season the gaze and admiration of men; the first, however, is like some polar star, whose modest but steady shining will point the way and cheer the heart of many a weary pilgrim in the desert world, and bring to his true reckonings again many a wayward, storm-tossed wanderer on the ocean of time.

Silver Run, Md., August 29, 1891.

VI.

SUNDAY OBSERVANCE.*

BY REV. FRANKLIN K. LEVAN, D.D.

By the favor of the committee having the arrangement of the program of the Spiritual Conference in charge, the subject of *Sunday Observance* has been assigned to me. The theme is a broad one, and it admits of discussion from several points of view. Which of them was in the mind of the committee as the one that should be made controlling in the discussion to-day I cannot tell; controlling in the sense that it should be mainly or principally considered, inasmuch as to view the subject in all its bearings would make of this paper an extended essay. It was not meant, nor do I intend, that it should be such. I propose to be brief, and to confine myself to general principles and facts.

I. Sunday observance may be considered *historically*. It is a vast subject looked at in this light. To do it justice would require that we call up the long line of ages during which it has obtained, and the various races and nations which have acknowledged its claims and yielded practical obedience, more or less complete, to its command. To show how Sunday has been observed, to show this even in outline sketch, would be the unfolding of a chequered history, intensely interesting from first to last. What not that is dear, that is high, that is beautiful and good in the life, the progress, the aspirations and hopes of men, would we behold bound up with it? The figure is probably not overdrawn when we say that, as the roseate

* A paper read August 4th, 1891, at Lancaster, Pa., before the Association of Reformed Ministers and Elders for Spiritual Conference.

morning stands out over against the gloom and the darkness of the receding night, much so the people who have a Sunday as a Sabbath and keep it as the Lord's Day stand out over against the rest of the world who either know it not, or, knowing it, fail to conform their life and institutions to it.

II. In the second place our subject might be considered in the light of the direct and the indirect Scriptural injunctions relating to it. The Scriptures abound in matter of this kind, and it is given a prominent position throughout, both as to statement and reference. We have the commandment with respect to the Sabbath, for it is there practically already a commandment, as part of the account of the creation; we have the unquestionable direct commandment as one of the ten words of the Mosaic law given on Mount Sinai. Then come the institutions and regulations under the Old Covenant; some of them temporary and limited as to the people; some of them, however, of lasting obligation and of application to all people, because they are men. It is to be noted, too, that these Sabbatical injunctions, with all their bearings, are not abstract nor arbitrary; for the very first appearance thereof stands in concrete connection with the successive acts of the creation, and the repetition thereof, in the various forms, stands in like concrete connection with the life of a people running through many centuries.

In the New Testament we have the practical interpretation put upon these same Sabbatical laws by the Founder of Christianity. We have a number of statements as to how Jesus Christ Himself observed the Sabbath, and of many things which He said respecting it. Then we have the institution of the *new Sabbath*, though *not* a second one, in connection with the new creation and the new covenant,—*the Lord's Day*,—and the obligations which were attached to it in this form. There is room for a volume of interesting discussion in the line here indicated.

If we make a distinction, as we ought, between the manner in which, on the one hand, the Sabbath, or our Lord's Day, has

been kept historically considered, and the conceptions, on the other hand, which have prevailed, or which now prevail, as to how the day ought to be kept, a consideration of the latter would find its place under this second head. And as all things cannot be done at once, the main purpose might be answered by looking at the conceptions which at present are really so held in the Christian Church as to influence men in their conduct. The Christian Sunday is an institution of modern society as well as a holy day of the Church. The majority of people, probably, form their opinions of it, and give it such observance as we find current, because of its institutional character, and according to it, full as much as because of what the Scriptures teach concerning it. We have here a mixed or double source of authority for the popular mind, unavoidably so, and it is in this way that we come to have so many varying conceptions as to what constitutes proper, or, to use a current term, sufficient Sunday observance.

Allow us to name a few of the leading conceptions, which, however, with many persons, run more or less into each other.

a.) There is the strict Sabbatarian view, which seeks to transfer the Levitical Sabbath as to the manner of keeping it to Anno Domini 1891.

b.) There is the view which holds that it is the Lord's day, and that the whole of it is the Lord's day, and as such it combines rest, worship and the service of charity.

c.) There is the European Protestant view, more strict in Reformed sections, less strict in Lutheran sections, which admits of limited work, business and pleasure in the afternoon of the day.

d.) There is the view common in Roman and Greek Catholic countries, which attaches scarcely any special sacredness to the day as such, but places the sacredness in the religious services altogether, which are assigned to the day; and so it ceases to be a holy-day and degenerates into a holiday.

e.) Other views there are still, very miscellaneous in character, but not calling for detailed mention here; for the four which we

have specified are the principal ones, and comprehend within their outlines the convictions of probably nine-tenths of the population of the nominally Christian world.

III. We come now, in the third place, to consider our subject in yet another form. We ask the questions: Why is there any Sunday observance at all? What are the bottom reasons for it? What do these reasons require of us? and by what authority do they address us?

In answer to the question, *Why is there any Sunday observance at all?* and the other, which is of like nature, *What are the bottom reasons for it?* we reply that both find their answers in the positive Divine Revelation to man on the subject; and in that Revelation the reasons for the institution of the Sabbath day and the manner of observing it are represented as lying in the very constitution of man, in his relation to the natural order of the world, on the one hand, and in his relation to the Almighty Creator and Father, in whose image and similitude he has been made, on the other.

In Genesis, second chapter, second and third verses, we have the first account having reference to this particular day and its special character. There we read, "And on the seventh day God ended his work, which he had made; and he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it, because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made."

According to this statement the Sabbath day begins with God; not, first, in the sense that He gave a commandment with respect to it, but in the sense that it *came by and into the order of His own being and activity*, and that by His own will. *This is to be noted as being here given as the causing cause for the existence of the day for us men.* Having finished the general work of the creation, God "rested," in the sense in which He can "rest." THAT is for Himself and of Himself; and then, looking forward to man, who should bear His own image and likeness, He blessed and sanctified the day for him. For this rest of God, this state in the being of God which the word "rest" is here

used approximately to express, is also eventually to become the condition of man, in so far as he carries within himself the image and similitude of God. The "rest" of God is here represented as *following* that side of His activity which stands out in the creation of the natural, material universe; and the strictly corresponding rest for man *follows* after the individual has wrought out his connections with and relations to this same natural material order, and passed over into that sphere of which Holy Writ, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, saith, "There remaineth therefore a rest for the people of God," in very probable allusion to the primitive passage which we are considering. But man cannot pass through this present world and life, and enter into the divine state of rest without self-conscious and self-determined preparation. God, who foresaw the entanglements in which man stands here, and the difficulties with which he is surrounded, God All-merciful adumbrated that heavenly rest; more than that, He took as it were of that heavenly rest and interjected it into time, by separating, blessing and sanctifying every seventh day in the revolution of the earth in which He placed man; *this* He did that it might be to man, if he will, a means, an anticipation, an approximation, a foretaste, of his eternal rest. In this terse picture, drawn by the inspired penman in Genesis, we have the fundamental *why*, and the *bottom reason* for what we now call *Sunday Observance*.

We now pass on to a consideration of the fourth commandment. It is not right, nor does it give us a full view of the subject, if we begin with this, as the habit of many persons is. The fourth commandment is a resultant, and amplification on the human side, of what the description in Gen. 2: 2, 3 sets forth, and cannot well be considered in advance of that, much less without regard to that.

"Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy. Six days shalt thou labor, and do all thy work: but on the seventh day is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God. In it thou shalt not do any work, thou, nor thy son, nor thy daughter, thy man-servant, nor thy maid-servant, nor thy cattle, nor thy stranger that is

within thy gates. For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, the sea, and all that in them is, and rested the seventh day. Wherefore the Lord blessed the Sabbath day, and hallowed it."

You will notice that the description given in the first chapter of Genesis, and in the first three verses of the second chapter, pervades all over the thought and wording of this fourth commandment. But leaving that out of special view for the moment, let us look somewhat closely at this commandment. It has the definite injunction : "*Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy.*" The day is assumed to be *holy*, for we are told, at the close, that God Himself has "blessed" it and "hallowed" it. Man shall allow it now to be such for himself, and he shall keep it after such manner, that is, in a *holy way*; and further, he is forbidden the doing or the permitting to be done, of certain things which would interfere with the realization of the object on the part of man for which the day was originally instituted. The commandment is plain, distinct in language, and comprehensive in meaning.

Let us now ask, *With what authority does the fourth commandment address us?* In one sense we have answered that already in the exposition of that passage in Genesis which has reference to the original institution of the Sabbath, inasmuch as this commandment is directly based upon the facts there related. Nevertheless the question is still proper and important in another sense. Practically there will be (and always has been) Sunday observance, in character and extent, according to the authority which is felt to lie in this fourth commandment. What is that authority?

1.) We find this commandment in the Word of God. It stands there as one among many, with nothing to indicate inferior merit on its part over against the rest. It confronts us as part of the Divine Word, and, as such, with the authority which belongs to that Word, generally speaking.

2.) It is one of the Ten Commandments, distinctively so called, and on the same level as to force with the other nine.

It is one of the *ten sacred words*, with which no table of laws in the history of man has ever been able to stand comparison. From the first even until now they have stood by themselves, a single ten, unapproached and unapproachable, like the mountain from which they were given at the time of their bestowal.

3.) Of all the ten commandments it can be said, that they lie in the order of things. There is nothing arbitrary about them. If they had never been given to Moses, if man had never come to a clear knowledge of them, they, one and all, would have been commandments still in the sense of laws, and nothing less. "Honor thy father and thy mother" lies in the eternal relation that must exist between parent and child. "Thou shalt not kill" is the cry of human nature over against the individual who lifts up a murderous hand. So each in its way with the commands, "Thou shalt not commit adultery," "Thou shalt not steal," "Thou shalt not bear false witness," "Thou shalt not covet." Just so with the first, second and third commandments. And the fourth one forms no exception to the one absolute rule. That God revealed to men these His laws—*laws*, mark you—was an act of mercy, of Fatherly love to them in their ignorance. Revelation makes the law plainly known and gives it the form of a commandment.

In this light then we must view the fourth commandment and, too, the keeping of it; with this kind of authority, which is a Divine authority in its most comprehensive form, it confronts us. That command is of perpetual force.

We are now ready to consider our Lord's Day, the Christian Sunday. And, first, as to the change from the seventh to the first day of the week.

The historic record of this change, with the implied cause for it, we find in St. John 20: 19, where we read: "The same day at evening, being the *first* day of the week, when the doors were shut where the disciples were assembled for fear of the Jews, came Jesus and stood in the midst, and saith unto them, Peace be unto you." And in the twenty-sixth verse of the same chapter we read: "And after eight days again his disci-

ples were within, . . . then came Jesus, and stood in the midst, and said, Peace be unto you." It was also on the day of Pentecost, fifty days from Easter, and thus the first day of the week, that the disciples of Jesus were assembled for worship, that the gift of the Holy Ghost came, and the infant Christian Church was founded, and three thousand souls were added to the original number of disciples.

We need not specially to repeat here how all these things grew out of the fact of the resurrection of Jesus Christ, and continue to stand in most intimate connection with it. That resurrection life took up into itself, as the higher always takes up into itself that which is lower, the old Sabbath day with all its significance and obligations, *and glorified it*, even as the human body of the risen Lord had been glorified; and that, per necessity, carried with it the change from the seventh day of the week, the day marking the period of the finished material creation, to the first day of the week, dating the completion of redemption and the entrance into the state of glory of the Son of man, and for men. The disciples of Jesus did not make a change; they simply accepted a change, which the new conditions, resulting from Christ's redeeming work, had wrought.

In the other and more essential respects, what effect had the resurrection of Jesus Christ upon the ancient Sabbath? That is a most practical question, and it has much to do with our subject of *Sunday Observance*.

The Apostle Paul tells us that our Lord, the same night in which He was betrayed, when He took the cup and gave it to His disciples, said: "This cup is the *New Testament in my blood*." A New Testament, then; a New Covenant; in reality and in truth. Not an inferior one, but a higher, more glorious one. In this New Testament the Christian Sabbath, our Lord's Day, stands, and by its conditions it is of necessity governed, and of its character it of necessity partakes. Coming to particulars, then, our general postulate being accepted as stated, we feel safe in setting forth the following points:

1. The new order of man's spiritual life, brought about by the incarnation and by the resurrection of our Lord, did not abrogate the Sabbath day as we find it originally constituted, and subsequently divinely enjoined. All its essential characteristics remained, but were lifted up, illuminated for man, just as the essence of the Old Covenant remained in the life and the light of the New.

2. What was abrogated were the Jewish non-essential ordinances and traditions. The *legalistic* attributes, resulting from the peculiar historic course run by the people of Israel, were removed, stripped off and done away with, in order to bring into the foreground its original *humanistic* character, as indicated by the Lord Jesus when He said that man was not made for the Sabbath, but the Sabbath was made for man.

3. The disciples, as we learn from passages already quoted, and from others which might be added, observed the day of the resurrection, and the corresponding day of the week thenceforward, in meditating and consulting concerning their risen Lord, and concerning the things of the kingdom. Then worship in the form of preaching, prayer, song and the administration of the Eucharist, took its place in connection with the day. So also the bringing of gifts of charity and the doing of works of charity,—a charism strongly brought out at an early stage in the development of the infant Christian Church. All these *observances* of the *Christian Sunday*, and the shutting out and forbidding, among believers, of whatever was in contradiction to them, or out of harmony with them, in thought or practice, were firmly rooted and established during the life-time of the apostles.

4. We notice in all this a *marked change* in the keeping of the day as compared with Jewish habits; a change not to secularism, as the so-called continental Sunday has it, and as there are strong clamorings in our own land for having it; not in the *why* of making it a day on which wickedness and sin might have free play and run riot; *but*, a day on which the higher spiritual nature of man might come into full recognition in the

soul of each person, going out in the manifold forms of worship, now in humble contrition, then joyfully, exultingly, and reaching to man the hand of charity, affection, peace and brotherly appreciation.

CONCLUDING REFLECTIONS.

1.) It has been our object to bring to view the real basis on which our Christian Sunday rests, in order that we might come truly to know its essential character; for upon that must depend all Sunday observance that is intelligent and that has in it power to stay.

2.) Sunday observance stops short in the Christian Church, at the present time, of much that is involved in it, as considered from a practical, possible standpoint. Nor has, at any time, the real in the case come up to the possible ideal. This statement holds especially as to certain countries and sections of countries, and also as to the different parts included in such an observance as the day calls for. And when we come to what is called Christian society in the more general sense, the case, as might be expected, is still worse. The Christian state is behind the Christian Church, and not up with it.

3.) God's ideals, that look to the real, all in the end reach the real. The life of the Church, representing the life of the risen Lord, as it brings all things to their consummation, *steadily works* to the purification of this holy day on the part of Christians from all that is foreign to it, and to the employing of it, *for their good*, with whatsoever is natural and proper to it. The Christian dispensation and Testament, in which we stand, tends by irresistible force to approximate our observance of the Sunday to that observance implied in the Sabbath day of the creation and in the glorified Lord's day of the resurrection of Christ, in so far as they look to our earthly relations. No need of fear on this point.

4.) All progress in better keeping of the sacred day is in the way of reformation in the Church, either as a whole or in parts of it, and society and the state gradually follow after in those

respects which are open to them; for, let us not forget, that many, and the best things, which enter into Christian Sunday observance are of the kingdom simply in which Christ is Lord, and may not be touched by society or the state as such. What we technically call the Reformation, namely that of the sixteenth century, did wonders in clarifying the vision of Christian people with reference to the Lord's day, as well as with reference to other matters; and it did equal wonders in establishing a better, truer keeping of it than had been habitual. That Reformation did for this day on a large scale what must continually take place on a smaller scale. It was in and of the Church; and there we must do our work to the same end. From all this we see also, that much of the effort, current at the present time, to bring about the better observance of Sunday, begins at the wrong place, because the appeal is made to the community and world at large, and this same world, in its own sphere, has little use for the Christian Sunday.

5.) And now, if the position, which we have assumed and illustrated in this paper, with respect to the Christian Sunday, which must also of necessity determine the observance of it, be correct, it would be in place to examine all existing Sunday observances among us in the Church, and pass judgment, favorable or unfavorable, upon them, *according as they stand or fall by this standard.* Then we would also find that observances needed to be added to those which we now have; for it is evident enough that there are duties, privileges and blessings enshrined in this day and in the keeping of it, which we do not now observe, or observe with slight appreciation. We do not feel called upon to undertake such an examination of existing Sunday observances, in addition to what we have already said. It must suffice to have made the suggestion.

VII.

SIMON BAR-JONA: THE STONE AND THE ROCK.

BY MRS. T. C. PORTER.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

A TRIED STONE.

"Simon, Simon, behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat."—St. Luke xxii. 31.

SECTION VII.

Peter's Ignorance.

LET US return, now, to Simon Bar-Jona, the first representative Christian, who was to differ from all his fellow-disciples in being tempted of Satan and tried of God at the same time with his Master, and in the same place—the palace of the high priest. The like pressure was to be brought to bear upon him—the terror of the cross. And that pressure was intended to prove whether he would hold fast to the Christ, and also to reveal him to himself.

In his confession Simon had struck on the first, the grand, central and distinguishing truth of the Christian religion—the eternal sonship of its founder. But of the next in order, of the truth that this eternal Son had become incarnate to "take away the sin of the world" by dying for it, he was then unconvinced, or he would not have rebuked their Master when He foretold His violent death. Nor could Peter, at the present time, have denied the Lord had he known Him experimentally as a redeemer. He had been born into the family of Christ an unconscious child, and having known Him only as a friend and brother, he was now to learn to know Him as a saviour and father. But since without knowing himself to be a sinner, no

one can receive Jesus actually as a saviour, Peter, preparatory to this, was to be taught his own natural condition as a lost son of the first Adam.

Simon was willing to sit with docile spirit at the Master's feet, or follow Him over the world in deeds of charity, or, leaving the crowd, abide with Him on the mount of Transfiguration ; but he was not willing to hear that He "must suffer many things, and be killed." He rebelled at the thought of His dying. It was not His crucifixion that he objected to now. Of that, he had not the remotest idea. Neither at the first, nor the second mention of it, did the Messiah state the particular *mode* of His death. He barely made known the fact, with some of its cruel accompaniments, it is true, but it was against the fact in any shape that Simon remonstrated. A protest against violence and suffering merely, Jesus would not have rebuked so sharply as when He said, "Get thee behind me, Satan." Peter was but the ignorant mouth-piece of the devil when he desired the Lord to shun the death that He alone had then in view. At that stage of his discipleship and new life, he had not realized that Jesus "must be killed," nor why, nor in what particular way.

But many more wished Him to abide forever, and Simon's desire gratified would have left Him, as it did them, a Jew in nothing but the name. It is the vicarious death of Christ that distinctly marks the Jewish church. The true Jew believed in this, even when, for lack of greater light and knowledge, he could not reach His highest divinity. "Behold the Lamb of God which taketh away the sin of the world!" exclaimed the Baptist. It is also marked distinctively by the confession of His sinless humanity joined with His atoning work. "And I saw, and bare record that this is the Son of God," added John, by which he meant that Jesus was the Messiah purposely created and consecrated for sacrifice. But this, joined to the other, while it raised him to, did not lift him beyond the highest Jewish faith. It is the Christian faith which is further marked by His divinity, resurrection and the giving of His

life in regeneration; though Peter had not yet gained the knowledge of more than the first of these, and was ignorant of his own participation in the last.

The words of Nathanael at his first meeting with Jesus are sometimes made to infringe on the special privilege of Simon Peter. How could Nathanael, at the very opening of Christ's ministry, have the slightest conception of that deep and profound secret (His Divinity) which was reserved for the future! or how could any of the disciples, at their first meeting with the Messiah, even so much as hint at that which was to be revealed, and they were to learn only gradually! None of them, at that early date, could begin to imagine, much less suggest, the immense truth, which, in the fulness of time, was to be evoked from their lips by the close and authoritative questioning of their Master. Nor could any of them voice, or confess it, before the hour when He should press them to speak. And this hour did not arrive till two years after the calling of the disciples.

Philip, likewise, when he brought Nathanael to Jesus with the words, "We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write," had no idea that the Messiah's nature was twofold. And even of His inferior origin, his estimate was very low. For in the same breath with which He pronounced Him to be "He who should come," he called Him "the *Son of Joseph!*" So late as on the eve of His crucifixion Jesus was obliged to say to this disciple—"Have I been so long time with you, and yet hast thou not known me, Philip?"

Nathanael's exclamations of surprise, "Rabbi, thou art the Son of God; thou art the King of Israel!" were not a confession. The first was merely an acknowledgment that Jesus was their true Messiah, and the last, that He was more than "the King of the Jews," namely, the King of those who were Israelites indeed, notwithstanding He had "come out of (wicked) Nazareth." As a confession prompted by the Spirit, they would have been an anti-climax; whereas, "the Holy

"Ghost" (an old divine somewhere quaintly and beautifully says) "is the most elegant of all speakers."

Nathanael did not mean by "the Son of God" the same that Simon Bar-Jona meant by "the Son of the *living* God." Whatever advance he may have made afterwards, he was not, at that time, confessing Christ's personality. He was not saying whether He was human, or divine, or both; whether He had one nature, or two. Least of all was He intimating His eternal divinity. Peter's conviction of Christ's higher nature, however, had grown so fast and strong that it threatened to obscure, for him, His lower nature. Of this he failed to see the significance. He could neither recognize the propriety and necessity of their Master's death, nor its vicarious character. When Jesus began to reveal His certain fate, Simon boldly remonstrated against it. But though in so doing he greatly erred and met with a severe rebuke, his name was not struck from the roll of Christians, because the belief in and confession of the Messiah's eternal divinity is the first and most distinguishing feature of their faith. The conviction of his own lost estate, and Christ's salvation, would yet make Peter a Jew of the highest type—that is, "one inwardly."

Though only half-seeing, the Son of Jonas had laid his finger unerringly on the open glory of the Christian religion, and touched the hidden spring of the Jewish. "By the Spirit," he had called the Messiah, "Lord." One part of David's lesson he had learned; but of the other, he knew nothing; and, as in David's case, so in his this part was to be borne to him by a bitter experience. Having ascended to the height of the Messiah's divinity, he was now to descend to the depth of His humanity, and learn that Christ was more than a partaker of man's sinless nature—even that He had *assumed* or taken on Himself as if it was His own, his sinful nature! He had learned the answer to the great question—"What think ye of Christ, Whose Son is he?"—put by Jesus (afterward in the temple and on the eve of His death) to the scribes

and Pharisees, and which they found so unanswerable. But he was now to learn its sequel. Only thus could Simon become such a Christian as the Master had promised he should be—one able to teach by precept and example, worthy to open “the kingdom of heaven,” and in the temple built without hands be a sure foundation-stone. It might do for others to grope in darkness ; or to speak, like the scribes, as those having no authority. It might do for thousands to remain (as St. Paul complains) all their lives long “babes in Christ,” but it would not do for St. Peter. He was to be in the Christian church what John the Baptist was in the Jewish, “a burning and a shining light.” He was to lead the van of the Lord’s hosts, and the trumpet they were to follow dare give no uncertain sound.

“ While the Pharisees were gathered together, Jesus asked them, saying, What think ye of Christ? *Whose Son is he?*” “ They say unto him, The Son of David.” The answer to that question was easy, and Simon Peter had virtually made it when he said to Jesus, “ Thou art the Christ,” for all men knew that the Messiah was to come in the line of David. But Peter’s reply included more than the reply of the Pharisees. He believed what they did not, and would not—that the Christ was sinless. Hence his answer contained the element of a grand truth which that of the Pharisees wholly lacked. It was the truth that Jesus was the Son of what would have been David’s real, or true life, had Adam never sinned. Having been “conceived by the Holy Ghost,” He had been born of *that* life, and thus was what no other scion of David could be. He was *the*, or the *only* Son of David. The Scriptures do not stop till they make His “great original,” “Adam,” *before* he sinned. The original of all other men is Adam *after* he sinned. How easily, then (when the time came for the Old Testament saints to be actually regenerated) could David’s sinless human “offspring,” become David’s sinless human “root!”

The further question of the Christ’s Divinity, Jesus did not

here argue with the Pharisees. He quietly assumed that since "David himself in, or by the Holy Spirit," calleth him Lord, saying, The LORD said unto my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand, till I make thine enemies thy footstool,"† He must be Divine. But out of that assumption grew another question for the Pharisees to answer. And that was—"How," or "Whence," or by whose agency did He, who was already in existence before David, and even "before Abraham," become, in their day, David's mortal, human Son? "If David then calleth him (the Christ) Lord, How, or Whence, is he his Son?"

"And no man was able to answer him a word, neither durst any man from that day forth ask him any more questions."

They were now to suffer the legitimate result of their rejection of the Holy Ghost; for He was the "How" and the "Whence," of the incarnation. He was the agent of the human and the divine in the Messiah! He was the author of the indissoluble union of David's "Lord" and David's Son!

But these were only leading questions, intended to open the way for others, had the scribes and Pharisees been willing to follow. Besides, to answer them correctly, required a knowledge that scribes and Pharisees, and even Peter, had never attained to. However, Simon was to reach it now; and once knowing, he would accept and preach it, with all it involved, to the end of his days.

"How" is the Christ at the same time David's "Lord" and "Son," would have been followed by the questions, Why is He both of these in one? and Why should the "Lord" become a partaker of man's mortal flesh, put on the appearance or "likeness of sinful flesh," lead a life of suffering, and endure a painful and violent death?

"Why?" Because He was man's father by creation, and man had sinned and cut himself off from his maker and father; and the incarnation and all the acts of the life of the one, two-

*St. Matt. xxii. 41-46. St. Mark xii. 35-37. St. Luke xx. 41-44. R. V. *Ibid.*

† Psalm cx. 1.

fold Christ, together with His descent again, in spirit, and by the Spirit, was the sole method by which the two—God and man—could be brought together again. Of his lost estate by nature, Peter had never been convinced. This was his ignorance. But he was to be taught now; it, and its remedy. And the only way he could learn it was by being given to “Satan,” to be “sifted as wheat.”

SECTION VIII.

Satan.

In considering St. Peter's trial, it should be approached with a reverence similar to that with which the Master's is studied. Simon's was not a premeditated sin, like David's. Nor was it the outcome of a long course of evil practice, like the sin of Judas. It was the result of a sudden and violent assault from the great enemy of souls, and ordained by God. When “Jesus was led up into the wilderness to be tempted by the devil,” He was “led up of the Spirit.” When Job was given over to Satan, he was given by God. God initiated his temptation and trial by asking Satan, “Hast thou considered my servant Job?” As Christ at His crucifixion was made to endure the attacks of the adversary, so Peter was now to be alike tempted and tried. And this was as much for the Master's satisfaction, as for his own enlightenment. If it was necessary that the perfect corner-stone of the Jewish church should be thoroughly tried before it was laid as the foundation of the Christian, how much greater was the need that its brilliant neighbor should be tested. It shone, and yet it might not be sound. If it was important that the Master be proved, why not the disciple? Hence the first declaration, “Thou shalt be called Cephas,” and the second, “Thou art Peter,” was followed by the third, “Behold, he is in thy hand; *but save his life.*”

That Satan should desire to lay his hand on the disciples,

was only natural. It accorded with his character as the enemy of the Messiah, to hate His people. Of all Christ's foes, Satan was the oldest and bitterest. He had enticed the parents of the race from their allegiance to Him, and heard the promise that the Seed of the woman should bruise the serpent's head, and of the multitudes who watched for His coming, none waited with the anxiety that Satan did. It was he who incited Herod to slaughter the babes of Bethlehem in hope of crushing the Herculean infant; and he dogged the footsteps of Jesus of Nazareth, now as friend and now as foe, from the cradle to the grave. Him, he found invincible, but not so His disciples, especially the foremost of them. His importance Satan knew well. It being his habit to lurk among the sons of God, he had heard Peter's wonderful confession, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God," and marked the instant response of Jesus, "And thou art Peter; and I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," and from that hour, in Satan's resolve, Simon Bar-Jona was a doomed man. A second Son of God, who was to carry the keys, and open that kingdom of heaven destined to supersede and finally overthrow his own, was a worthy prize, second only to the Messiah Himself!

However, he could not touch him without the consent of Him who had many times proved Himself his Master, and therefore he boldly asked him of the Lord. He begged for Peter, as of old he had begged for Job! And the Lord granted his request! He yielded His first-born son into the hands of Satan to be sifted as wheat! And why not? Had not the Messiah, at His baptism, stood sponsor for Simon's repentance as well as faith? And, having believed because he had been taught to know the Christ, how could Peter repent unless he were also taught to know himself—taught, not by being made to sin, but by God's hiding His face from him while Satan tempted him to sin? After having revealed to Simon the glory of the Messiah, the Holy Spirit was pledged to show him the secret evil of his own heart. Only thus

could those great acts of Christ—His suffering and dying—to which Peter had so strongly objected, be made plain to him. The time had come for Jesus to answer his rash prayer and, for a little while, "depart from him."

Three times Christ had emphasized the name of Peter, and three times Satan had determined that Peter should deny the Christ and himself, and by this accomplish his own ruin. He had succeeded in removing the Baptist, that crying "Voice" which proclaimed the Messiah and His work so far and wide. What was to hinder him from silencing this too-ready tongue—nay, more—to make it the instrument of its own destruction? Satan saw no great obstacle in the way, for though the Master might be invincible, the servants were not (as Judas was showing) and therefore, His consent obtained, he joyfully laid his plan.

True, what was to hinder him from destroying this new, created life, even as in the beginning he destroyed the first? It was not less mortal than it, and of this, and that Christ was his Father, Peter was ignorant as a babe.

When the Shepherd of the flock should be smitten (Satan reasoned) and His sheep, in their flight, rush hither and thither, tumultuously away, the feet of Simon could easily be caught in the snare that he would lay for him. If the great Jewish church itself was destined to tremble and totter, and its noble "Head of the corner" to fall with the shock of an earthquake, why should not its first neighboring stone be detached, the succeeding ones scattered, and the twelfth and last, the unsoundest of all, be broken to pieces? Or, O joy! might not the sheep which he would torment the most, leap under his goadings, and rush, like the other, to its wilful death? Plotting thus, Satan gladly and widely spread his snare; but ever, as he encircled closer and closer his unwary prey, the Messiah watched with vigilant eye.

*SECTION IX.**Christ's Warnings.*

"Simon, Simon," the Master warned him as the hour of trial approached, "behold, Satan hath desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat." All the disciples were to be put to the test, but Simon's trial was to be, by far, the severest—"But I have prayed for *thee*, that *thy* faith fail not." And then, jealous for his honor as the eldest and the leader, his faithful promiser immediately added: "and when thou art converted" (or completely turned to me again) "strengthen thy brethren."

"Lord," rejoined Peter, "I am ready to go with thee, both into prison, and to death." But with the feeling that this going was something secret and mysterious, he asked, "*Whither* goest thou, Lord?" "*Whither* I go, thou canst not follow me now," Jesus answered; "but thou shalt follow me afterwards." To this, Peter, with that childlike persistence so natural to him, continued—"Why cannot I follow thee now?" And then, growing more earnest, he solemnly averred—"I will lay down my life for thy sake." "Wilt thou lay down thy life for my sake?" responded Jesus, gazing mournfully at his unconscious fellow-sufferer, "Verily, verily, I say unto thee, The cock shall not crow, till thou hast denied me thrice."

"All ye shall be offended because of me this night," He again told them. But Simon, innocent of any meditated guilt, and strongly confident in his absorbing love for the Master, volunteered to say, "Although all shall be offended, yet will not I. If I should *die with thee*, I will not deny thee in any wise." "Likewise also said all the disciples. 'I tell *thee, Peter*,'" rejoined the Lord, "the cock shall not crow this day till thou hast thrice denied that thou knowest me." And then He ceased to caution him; for Peter, like the others, could not, and would not believe

that there was any evil in himself till he had actually seen it.

How marvelous his disregard of Christ's earnest warnings! How totally he had forgotten the petition He had taught them, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from the evil one,"* and the express command, "Watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation!" How astonishing his apathy when Jesus, seeking the sympathy of His disciples in Gethsemane, appealed to him by name—"Simon, sleepest thou?" Simon, who of all men should be awake, and on the alert! "Couldest not thou watch one hour?" Alas! the Messiah was destined to tread the wine-press alone, and of the people there were to be none with Him. After the angel had strengthened Him, the powers of darkness and of light were both against Him. Earth cast Him out, and Heaven hid its face from Him. Then was He "lifted up," above earth and below heaven, into "the Air," to combat "the prince of the power of the air," that "the Father," "having made peace through the blood of His cross," might "by Him reconcile all things unto Himself."

How fearless, too, was Peter of the wiles of Satan the deadly foe of God and man! He had no conception of him as a real personality. The words that would be so appalling to a Christian now—"Satan hath desired to have you"—had no meaning for him then. The tendency of the age was against him. It was wholly towards unbelief. In the eyes of men there was neither God nor devil. Each was but the synonym of an abstract principle—the one of good and the other of evil. The faith of Abraham and the prophets had died out among the Jews. In relinquishing Jehovah's name, they had lost sight of His personality. The knowledge of Him and of Satan as personalities, Jesus had come to revive. And as after His departure this work could only be continued by His apostles; Peter, the chief,

* R. V. and N. T. Com. St. Matt. vi. 13.

was now to be convinced of the existence of Satan, of sin in himself, of his own actual transgression, and of—Christ's forgiveness.

SECTION X.

Peter's Trial and Fall.

Would it be strange if Simon should fall, being, though forewarned, yet so unconcerned and unprepared? All the events of the crucifixion were hurried and rapid. This was a part of Satan's plan; and the disciples, surprised in the garden, were completely bewildered. None of them had laid to heart the words of Christ, and while they were incredulous and negligent, His enemies had been working hard in secret. Their Master alone was able to preserve His equanimity, and command, "Let these go." Let these go! Could they have seen it, this was their Messiah's warrant, that, if faithful to Him, not a hair of their heads should be hurt. But Peter had rashly begun in the flesh, and the Master's order, "Put up thy sword!" was the death-blow to his courage. Despair entered his soul when he found that Jesus would not be defended. And then His conduct, in this respect, being incomprehensible to them, His disciples were "offended because of Him," even John the beloved, "and they all forsook Him, and fled." The Scripture was fulfilled, "I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered," for the Messiah was to be deserted by man, and by God.

This was Satan's opportunity. Having forsaken the Lord, Simon was now as weak as an infant, and, like an infant, as susceptible to evil as to good. The Adversary, subtle and cunning as of old, saw his chance and instantly rushed to the breach. Doubtless his tactics were the same for the disciple and the Master, and, as he plied the Messiah, so he plied Peter with taunts and insults unremittingly. His "Christ," and his "Son of the living God," hitherto so invulnerable, he showed him (in the palace of the high priest) must now die like other men! He could not always save Himself. Neither

would God, His "Father," interfere to help Him, nor could He protect His friends. But most of all, Satan knew the secret weakness of Pete's heart, the prejudice inherited and common to all the Jews, but especially to this one, most honest, upright and faithful to the traditions of his fathers; he knew, far better than he, that his innate dread was not of "prison," and torture,, and death." The Jewish church was ever prolific in martyrs, who could boldly die, fearless of these ; and Simon Bar-Jona would have been able, by the grace of God, to stand up as nobly as they, to die with the man who had proved Himself greater than all her prophets. But knowing, only too well, his fatal horror of that dreadful death of *hanging*, the only death over which the finger of Jehovah had written "*ACCUSED OF GOD*," Satan rang without ceasing into his distracted ears the coming cry of the multitude —"*Crucify Him!*" "*Crucify Him!*" A double blasphemer, He is worthy to die the death of deaths—accursed of God and man ! That foreboding, of which the air was full, together with Simon's sudden recalling of Christ's one solitary prediction, that the Jews should " deliver Him to the Gentiles to *crucify* Him," was enough. Peter, the boastful and confident, was now wholly ready for the devil's purpose.

At the first provocation he declared that he was not a disciple of Jesus of Nazareth. At the second, he protested with an oath, that he knew Him not. And again, at the third, with cursing and swearing, he affirmed the same—"I know not the man"—and Simon, the son of Jonas—nay, Peter, the son of the Christ (for any help in himself) was utterly undone. He had slain the new life within him ; he had destroyed his Christian consciousness ! By denying, he had cast off highest man. By perjury, he had cast off highest God. There was now no hope for him ; not in heaven nor in earth, not in God nor in man. As against his Master, so against him, those powers had all conspired. Earth forsook him. In those three long hours of trial, not a soul came near to chide, or warn, or strengthen him. Even Jesus was kept out of sight.

Heaven hid its face from him. His Lord could not "turn" nor "look," till it was too late. And Peter, left alone to the malice of hell and the devil and his own evil heart, was—almost—thoroughly lost.

"Almost?" Could he sink any deeper than this?

SECTION XI.

Satan's Success.

Just as in his first great conflict with Christ, in the wilderness, Satan tempted Him with the language of Scripture, so now he tempted Simon Peter. And the words he brought to bear on him were heavy with the wrath of God—"If a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be put to death, and thou *hang him on a tree*; his body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for *HE THAT IS HANGED IS ACCURSED OF GOD*;) that thy land be not *defiled*, which the *LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.*" *

With these alarming sounds—"hanged," and "accursed of God"—Satan drove the much-desired prey into his deeply-laid and darkly-hidden trap. Those words he knew would be enough to make the living jewel loose itself; and so be ready for him to fling from its lofty setting in the pinnacle of the temple, to the hard and rocky ground beneath. Then with the strength of an archangel and the fury of a demon he dashed this "glistening stone" to earth. And though thereat the "cock," affrighted, loudly "crew," the devil softly laughed and all his legions with him; for was not Peter, after his Master, the head and front of the coming kingdom? The new "church," against which "the gates of hell should not prevail," had proved most vulnerable. Of its twelve chosen stones, all had fallen. One was broken to pieces, and one was ground to powder. Of its twelve representatives, one had betrayed its head, ten had forsaken Him and fled, and one had forsaken, and fled, and denied Him. Joy, joy for Satan,

* Deut. xxi. 23.

but alas, alas for the church! for *those* were its foundation stones, and *this* its promised "rock."

Possibly, if Simon Peter had been asked to retract his confession, to deny in so many words that Jesus was the Christ and the Son of the living God, he would have frankly and stoutly refused. But Satan was wiser than thus to put him on his guard. He chose to approach him through his own weak humanity, and make him sin a sin of fear, instead of presumption. Unlike his First, the second subject of his attack was not to be reminded that he was "a Son of God." This truth was to be kept in the back-ground. Peter's fall was to be brought about very quietly. He was not to speak the name of Jesus. There was risk in it. This, his questioners were to do. They were merely to assert, and innocently, that he was a disciple, or follower of "Jesus of Nazareth," and Satan would see to the rest. "I know not the *man*," was all that Peter was to say, and the devil's object, thus far, would be obtained. But, even while he yielded to the promptings of Satan, Peter knew that he was denying himself and the Christ. This consciousness it was that angered him, and made him the more "to curse and to swear," and add sin to sin. Unhappy man! The deeper he sank, the purer and holier and greater did Jesus of Nazareth appear to him; and, degraded to the dust, he felt that as surely as Judas betrayed "the innocent blood," he had denied "the Christ," and "the Son of the living God!" What hope was left for him?

SECTION XII.

"I Know not the Man."

And yet, though Simon Bar-Jona never spake a falser, he also never spake a truer word than when he said, "I know not the Man." He knew Him well in the sense that Satan meant he should deny Him, and so saying—"I know him not"—he was guilty of lying. But, in another sense, he did, verily "know Him not;" and thus speaking, he ignorantly told the truth.

By applying to Himself the name of Jehovah, the Jews accused the Christ (and rightly) of making Himself "equal with God" in nature and essence. There was another horn to the altar on which their Messiah sacrificed Himself. In making Himself as *Man*, the Son of God by *generation*, He made God to be Man. His enemies felt this, and, for it, "took up stones to cast at Him," stones which proved to be very stones, and which did "cry out," because, through His intimation and their inference, they were, in their hands, alive and eloquent with this charge. They were as unable to receive *that* truth, as they were able to hold *this*—that man is not God. And yet the *trinity* was as much in their watchword of God is One, as the *unity* is in ours of God is also Three.

Between His *natures*, their Messiah drew a line broad and distinct. They were dissimilar as heaven and earth. But He never divided His *essences*. Alike in quality (human) and in form (triune) they had, without commixture or confusion, been united at His incarnation never again to be sundered. Hence, while its full meaning was yet a secret to all, He delighted in calling Himself, "the Son of *man*." It was His darling title. As the second Adam; it brought Him nearer to God who had made the first and solitary Adam in the "image" of His triunity, and because of that named him "man." It is the Christ's lowest and highest title and name; and, in the order of time, it is the first and the last revelation of His personality. Higher than "the Son of God" which describes only His natures, it describes His essences. His name of *Jesus* is indeed descriptive of His offices of Saviour and Mediator, and of His natural constitution as such. But in also meaning "the Son of *man*," it is older than either of those. The first Adam was a *man*, before he became a sinner, and the second Adam was born his sinless *Son* in order to *become* his Redeemer. Its meaning of "Saviour" only attained its fulness with His death, and its meaning of "Mediator" with His session at the right hand of God. But its highest meaning—*MAN*—is as old as eternity. Therefore, in being descriptive of His uncreated essence

also, it was elevated to that Name (Jehovah) which till Christ openly claimed it—"I AM"—had been to the Jews unspeakable: "Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that in the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of *things* in heaven and *things* on earth and *things* under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is LORD,* to the glory of God the Father."†

Christ's *natures* could be changed, but His *essences* never. The *eternal* Son of God could "become flesh" or *temporal*; and He is even represented as putting on man's mortality. The *created* Son of man could, in turn, put on the *uncreated* nature of God. But He could never, at any time, change the *human quality* of either of His essences by becoming unhuman, nor their *triune form* by becoming any other being than man. These are absolutely unchangeable. It may have been the greater comfort and pleasure, therefore, to the Messiah, while undergoing the changes and vicissitudes of our mortal life (and especially death), to hold fast to His manhood, created and uncreated, since both are alike indestructible. The Jews, however, saw only creation and mortality in the title of "the Son of man," and hence their charge of "blasphemy." So did Peter, or he could not have said, "I know not the man." And so did Satan, or he would not have overreached himself by allowing even his innocent tools to use the name of "*Jesus*," when he intended to bring about Simon's *total fall*.

This truth was not revealed to the loving disciple, Peter. He was called to confess no more than the Messiah's eternal divinity. His eternal humanity was reserved for the beloved

* For the full force of the word "Lord" in this passage, the Commentary on New Testament refers the reader to Acts ii. 35, and 1 Cor. xii. 3. According to Smith's Bible Dictionary on the first reference, the word Lord in it, though not so written, means Jehovah. And according to Dr. Hodge's Commentary on the second reference, the word Lord in it, though not so written, means Jehovah. It is taking no liberty then with the text, to write it in the quotation above with *capital*s, to show that there it does, really, signify Jehovah?

† R. V. Phil. ii. 9, 10, 11.

disciple, John, who was to imbibe it by leaning on the bosom of the Lord, and in his old age embody it in his gospel.

SECTION XIII.

"Ecce Homo!"

In the light of His eternity, "Behold the Man," whom Pontius Pilate, in those words, ignorantly presented to Jews and Gentiles, and whom they, blind to His person, rejected with the cry, "Away with him, away with him!" "Crucify him, crucify him!" In that light, "Behold the Man," whom Judas just as ignorantly betrayed; whom all the disciples unknowingly forsook; and whom Simon Peter, with cursing and swearing, unwittingly cast off altogether!

This is He, of whom St. Stephen, "being full of the Holy Ghost, and looking up steadfastly into heaven, and seeing the glory of God, and Jesus standing on the right hand of God," said, "Behold, I see the heavens opened, and the Son of Man standing on the right hand of God." The sudden revelation of *that* eternity of the Messiah, so illuminated his countenance, that "all who sat in the council, looking steadfastly on him, saw his fate as it had been the face of an angel." And that exclamation of his set the climax to the rage of the Jews, so that they "cried out with a loud voice, and stopped their ears, and ran upon him with one accord, and cast him out of the city, and stoned him calling upon the Lord."

This "Son of Man" (of *living Man* as well as "*living God*") is He whom the Messiah, at His trial, assured the high priest and the council they should "henceforth see sitting at the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven." The *force* of that assertion made the judge "rend his clothes," and ask, "What further need have we of witnesses? behold, now ye have heard his blasphemy. What think ye?" and the jury answer, "He is guilty of death." That *depth* of meaning (felt rather than seen) was the signal offence which made them "spit in his face, and buffet him, and smite him

with the palms of their hands," and say, "Prophesy unto us, thou Christ, Who is he that smote thee?"

This "manner of Man"—uncreated as well as created—Pilate, as the representative of the heathen nations, yielded to the Jews "to be crucified;" and the high priest, as the representative of the Jewish church, rejected; and Simon Peter, as the representative of the Christian Church, denied; while Jesus stood alone and confessed Himself as such to His own condemnation and death. Solitary He stood, "that every mouth might be stopped, and all the world become guilty before God;" since by reason of sin and Satan all the world had been rendered powerless to receive God. God had been man's creator in order to become his father. Had Adam not sinned, the welfare of the race would have been insured forever. The perfection of man's being was to be secured by the life of God. By his sin, Adam forfeited God's life for himself and his race. But this—their glorious inheritance and lost Paradise—the last and second Adam came to regain for, and restore unto men. Is it incredible, then, that in his last extremity the Christ should cling solely to His unchangeable essences? His unchangeable nature was covered with mortality. At present, it could afford Him no aid. His changeable nature was about to succumb to death, and would never return. His assumed and momentary character of a sinner was to disappear forever. What indeed was left for Him (and us) but, asserting His manhood, to hold fast to the truth that He was twofold in essence, and, in both, alike human and triune, and further, to declare that "Henceforth" He should be shown to be also alike in His natures, the mortal and temporal having "put on" forever the immortal and eternal.

That "great image" (seen by Nebuchadnezzar in his dream) with "head of gold, breast of silver, thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet part of iron and part of clay," could not have been "broken to pieces" by the "stone cut out of the mountain without hands," had the Christ (and His Church) whom this "stone" represented, been as unequal in essences as in

natures. Nor would that "stone, that smote the image," have become "a great mountain and filled the whole earth," had all of the Messiah's *humanity* been comprised in that which was conceived by the Holy Ghost and born of the Virgin Mary, and so been younger and weaker than His *divinity*. These are not unequal. The first halts not a whit behind the last, but with it keeps equal pace. The former is as eternal, or without beginning, as the latter; and, of "the Ancient of Days," the manhood is not a whit inferior to the godhood.

"Behold the Man," whom Simon Peter disowned and renounced in denying Jesus of Nazareth, and judge whether he was not wholly undone! Although ignorant (and Jesus remembered this) of the ful height of His personality, yet it was a perfect denial. The Lord had prophesied it with a "Verily, verily, thou shalt thrice deny that thou knowest me"—me—the totality of my being; and Peter knew, too, that in swearing, "I know not the man," "Jesus of Nazareth," he was yielding up the Messiah and all he had confessed of Him. Hence, not a recorder of it adds in excuse or palliation, This did he, "not knowing what he said."

Notwithstanding space had been granted him to reflect and repent, between each attack of Satan, the old life proved too strong for the new in Simon. However, this may be said in extenuation of his sin. Though he denied (actually and virtually) the Messiah in His whole *personality*, he did not deny Him in His *character* of a Saviour; and therefore Peter can afterwards speak boldly of those who "deny the Lord who bought them." St. Paul could never forget that he had "beyond measure persecuted the church of God, and wasted it," because he had learned Christ *after* all was fulfilled and revealed, and was then kicking against the strongest convictions that Jesus was their Messiah, and Jehovah, and the Saviour of the world. Peter, at the time of his denial, is not to be judged by what he only learned later, at Pentecost. After their Lord's resurrection, the disciples lingered with Him till His ascension; then, they waited in prayer for the promise to

endue them "with power from on high;" but not till the advent of the Spirit, could they preach Him as the saviour and mediator—the redeemer of sinners.

Believers learn Christ differently, and as He pleases. All are regenerated in the regular order of His life, but, for wise purposes, certain characteristics of it are made to take hold on some more strongly than on others, and consequently the children of Christ differ, like earthly children in showing prominently the varying traits of their parents. Simon had been convinced of just what, and no more, than the Master chose; and in sinning against his one great conviction and confession that Jesus of Nazareth was both David's "Son" and David's "Lord," he sinned against the Holy Ghost, for He had taught him this. But that same Spirit, who should also reveal to him Christ as a Saviour, was not, and could not be "given," in His plenitude, till *after* Jesus was "glorified." Hence, that revelation Peter could not receive in its fulness before Pentecost; nor indeed at any time, even in part, till he was first convicted of actual transgression. Therefore he did not at his denial sin against it. Moreover, when he fell, the Messiah's life was not yet marked by His sacrificial death. This death was the chief end Christ had in view when talking "plainly" to the Jews. Those public discourses concerning His origin and person were to result in His being brought before the council and condemned to die, and His voluntary acceptance of crucifixion was to make of Him an atoning sacrifice, and procure the descent of the Spirit, who, through St. Peter, would then offer Jesus of Nazareth to Jews and Gentiles as the complete, perfect and only Saviour.

Christ was indeed to be an "example" to all His followers to the end of time. And He was indeed to be "the propitiation for our sins." But His endurance of the cross (with all it meant for Him) was to so *mark His life* that through His people's actual inheritance of that life, in this world, by regeneration, He would become to them—His sons severely tried—"the Strength of martyrs" and the "King of saints."

VIII.

NOTICES OF NEW BOOKS.

CONCISE DICTIONARY OF RELIGIOUS KNOWLEDGE AND GAZETTEER. Edited by Rev. Samuel Macauley Jackson, M. A. Associate Editors: Rev. Talbot Wilson Chambers, D.D., LL.D., of the Collegiate Reformed Protestant Dutch Church, New York City, and Rev. Frank Hugh Foster, Ph.D., Professor of Church History, Theological Seminary, Oberlin, Ohio. Second and Revised Edition. New York: The Christian Literature Company, 1891. Price, \$8.50.

This volume, shortly after it was first published, was briefly noticed in this REVIEW. Its merits, however, especially as it now appears in a second revised and improved edition, entitle it to further consideration. The purpose of its preparation, as stated in its preface, is "to furnish in a concise form, information upon biblical, archaeological, ecclesiastical and historical topics."

That there was room for a dictionary of this description cannot be reasonably questioned. Every person desiring to be well-informed, as regards religious and ecclesiastical affairs, has long felt the need of some convenient book of this kind. The present work, therefore, supplies a real want. It does this, moreover, in a very acceptable and satisfactory manner. Its vocabulary, first of all, is very large. Scarcely any thing of a religious and ecclesiastical character or bearing has been omitted. Matters of doctrine and ritual, accounts of the various churches and sects and of the different religious orders and societies, as well as biographical sketches of eminent religious leaders and divines, both dead and living, are all to be found in its ample and closely-printed pages. Then the treatment of all the various subjects is concise, but nevertheless full enough for all practical purposes. The information given is indeed in all cases that which is most important and desirable. Furthermore great care has been taken to secure accuracy. After a somewhat extended examination of its pages we have discovered only a very few errors, and these mostly of an unimportant character. One of the errors that has come under our notice is in the article on the "Reformed Church," in which it is stated that "in 1836 Marshall College was founded at Lancaster, Pa.," when in reality it was founded in that year at Mercersburg, Pa., and only removed to Lancaster in 1853, when it was united with Franklin College, located in that city.

Other commendable and useful features of this dictionary are the syllabification of Bible names, with careful indication where the

stress of voice falls; the pronunciation, by respelling phonetically or by other means, of foreign names likely to be mispronounced; and the mention at the close of the respective articles of such literature as would enable the student to pursue his investigations further. The latter feature will be found especially serviceable to ministers and others who may be desirous of perfecting their knowledge as regards any particular subject.

The value of this second edition is moreover increased by the addition of a Gazetteer, consisting of fine, large maps, together with a complete index to each map. These maps have been expressly prepared for this work, and embody the latest results of research in the countries represented. They are respectively entitled, *The Lands of the Holy Scriptures, Palestine, The Countries Around the Mediterranean Sea During the Crusades, The Church Provinces about 1500 A. D., and the Protestants and Catholics in Middle Europe about 1550 A. D.* The addition of these maps with their indexes greatly increases the convenience and usefulness of the work.

We would heartily commend the book to the attention of all our readers. Ministers and Sunday-school teachers will especially find it very serviceable, as it is admirably suited for constant use. In our opinion no better book of the kind has yet been published.

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE LITERATURE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT. By S. R. Driver, D.D. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1891. pp. xxxi and 522. Price, \$2.50.

This is the first volume of a newly-projected Theological Library under the editorial care of Dr. Briggs, of Union Theological Seminary, New York, and Dr. Salmond, of Free Church College, Aberdeen. The enterprise is of an international character, and the ablest specialists in the several departments of theological science in England, Scotland and America have been engaged to carry it out. The Library will represent the best Christian scholarship of the age. Each volume, of moderate compass, but compact, will be complete in itself; taken together the volumes will cover the whole field of theology. It is a highly important undertaking, and cannot fail to exert a profound and healthy influence on the mind of the Church.

The series opens fitly with an "Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament." We heartily welcome this volume. It meets a long-felt need. One is often asked, "What shall I read, that I may acquaint myself with the present state of Old Testament Criticism?" Heretofore there has been little in the English language that one could recommend, as giving a fair representation, not only of the results revealed by the ablest critics, but also of the facts on which these results are based. Such a presentation has now been given us by the competent hand of Dr. Driver. He is Pusey's successor as Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford. He acquired a

name first in the sphere of philology, and stands in the front rank of Old Testament scholars. His work on "The Hebrew Tenses" is the standard authority on that subject in Germany, as well as in England and America. He next entered the field of textual criticism, and his "Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel," published in 1890, has added greatly to his already high reputation. Now he appears in a new *rôle*, as literary critic, for which he seems to be remarkably well qualified. To faith in divine revelation and profound reverence for the Bible as the record of that revelation, he joins a broad general scholarship, a thorough knowledge of the Hebrew language, an intimate familiarity with every part of the Old Testament, a well-balanced judgment that knows how to discriminate between the certain and the merely probable, a strong love of the truth and a calm courage in setting it forth. From such a man we expect much; and we do not hesitate to say that his latest work meets all just expectations. We can, of course give no detailed account of it in this brief notice. It must suffice to say that his method is historic-critical, and that his conclusions on all the vexed questions of Old Testament criticism are in the main those now held, rightly or wrongly, by the overwhelming majority of Biblical scholars.

PEOPLE'S COMMENTARY ON THE GOSPEL according to John. By Edwin W. Rice, D.D., Philadelphia: The American Sunday-School Union, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This book pleases us very much. As a commentary for the people it could not easily be excelled. The author has succeeded in compressing, within a small compass, a large amount of matter, critical, exegetical and historical, very helpful to a clear understanding of this most spiritual of the Gospels. At the foot of the page, in parallel columns, are given both the Common Version and the Revised Version with the American readings and renderings. The Gospel is divided into sections, each prefaced by a statement of the place and time of the recorded events, and by introductory remarks that throw much light on the section as a whole. The comments on the text are brief, but judicious and to the point, and display a careful study of the latest and best results of Biblical research. The book throughout is scholarly. This is apparent in the Introduction, which covers 24 pages, setting forth in compact form the external and internal evidence for John's authorship; the various theories of modern critics, negative and positive; the latest discoveries bearing on the question of genuineness; the author and object of the Gospel; the time and place of composition; the characteristics of the fourth Gospel; and its relation to the three Synoptics. We can conceive of nothing better adapted to the needs of the Sunday-school teacher, especially as it is accompanied by a map, the latest (1890) of the Palestine Fund, and by engravings from original and trustworthy sources, which lend much value and interest to the book.

THE SANGERFEST SERMONS. By James Boyd Brady, B.D., D.D., Pastor of Franklin Street Methodist Episcopal Church, Newark, N. J. Newark, N. J., Alvertiser Printing House, 1891. Price, \$1.60.

These sermons were called forth by what was regarded as a violation of the Sabbath by the "Great German Sangerfest," in their grand quadrennial in Newark, N. J., during which they held one of their festivals on the Christian Sunday, July 5th, 1891. They are a popular appeal for what is called the American Sabbath over against the continental Sunday. They are full of warm feeling and enthusiasm and no doubt produced a decided effect upon the large audiences that heard them. So far as the "Sangerfest" violated the laws of New Jersey they certainly were in the wrong and merited condemnation. So far as the general question of Sabbath observance is concerned we side with the American Sabbath. And yet, in doing so we cannot justify the Puritan idea of the Sabbath, which no doubt in some measure has provoked the reaction we behold against it, especially among the Germans. The Puritan Sabbath is more Jewish than Christian. What we need in this country is a Christian Sunday that shall be neither Puritan nor Continental, but such as was proclaimed by our Lord and observed by the Apostolic Church. We do not find in these sermons a treatment of the question as to how the Christian Sunday differs from the Jewish; and yet this difference needs to be determined in order to find a proper basis for our advocacy of Sunday observance. Some indeed maintain that the laws of Sabbath observance should be very strict because if one point is yielded more will be demanded; but it is better to have moderate laws and insist on their observance than the strictest rules that cannot be carried out. In our country this question challenges solution. It is of great importance and the churches should seek to mould public sentiment in favor of a quiet, orderly Sunday. Some years ago we spent a Sunday in Ayre, Scotland, the land of Burns, and on Saturday the town was overrun with drunkenness on the part of male and female, while the Sunday was as quiet as a graveyard. In Germany we found great freedom on Sunday, especially in southern Germany, but less disorder and excess on week-day. What we need in America is a medium between the two extremes, and such a Sunday the American people will sustain. We commend these sermons in their opposition to the desecration of the Lord's day.

ΚΟΛΑΕΙΣ ΑΙΩΝΙΟΣ; or Future Retribution. By George W. King, Pastor of the Broadway Methodist Episcopal Church, Providence, R. I. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.00.

An able discussion of the doctrine of eternal punishment. Why the Greek terms should be used in designating the title of the book is not evident. The work is divided into eight chapters, and these chapters discuss: 1. The eternity of punishment; 2. Objections and

arguments of Restorationists; 3. New Testament terminology respecting future retribution; 4. The ground of future endless retribution; or, *for* what are the wicked punished eternally; 5. The number of the lost; 6. The nature of future punishment; 7. The doctrine of annihilation; 8. The reason or law of necessity in future punishment.

The argument from Scripture is ably handled and quite satisfactory. With this we prefer to rest. The explanation by reason of the presence of sin and suffering in the universe is very difficult, and the eternity of future sin and suffering is a mystery which the human reason perhaps cannot compass, because we can think only within the limits of time and space, and therefore what is beyond reason here will doubtless become more evident hereafter. Still the author has done well in answering the objections to this Scripture doctrine. We may rest in the teachings of God's Word, whether we can explain it fully to reason or not. The work is prepared in the best style and reflects credit on the publishers.

THE DOCTRINE OF A FUTURE LIFE. By James Strong, S.T.D., LL.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton; Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, 60 cents.

This little work discusses the nature of God, as the unembodied Spirit, the embodied Spirit, man, the disembodied spirit, the soul after death and before the resurrection, and the re-embodied spirit, man after the resurrection. It is conservative in spirit, not venturing into vain speculations, but confining the discussions to what is revealed on these mysterious subjects. The author argues against a temporary body for the soul in the intermediate state, and seems to regard angels as unembodied spirits, but his assertions on both these subjects are very guarded. He seldom ventures beyond what is clearly revealed, and when he does it is in a very conservative spirit. We commend the book as worthy of being carefully read.

THE GOSPEL OF ST. JOHN. By Marcus Dods, D.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology, New College, Edinburg. In Two Volumes, Vol. I. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1891. Price, \$1.50.

THE ACTS OF THE APOSTLES. By the Rev. G. T. Stokes, D.D., Professor of Ecclesiastical History in the University of Dublin, and Vicar of All Saints', Blackrock. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1871. Price, \$1.50.

Both these volumes belong to the series known as "The Expositor's Bible," and both are possessed of conspicuous merit.

This first volume on the Gospel of St. John by Professor Marcus Dods is, indeed, a most admirable popular exposition of the first eleven chapters of this important portion of Scripture. In a clear, flowing and pointed style he gives a perfectly intelligible explana-

tion of their contents, and shows their intimate relation to the purpose which the Apostle had in view in writing them, namely, to promote the belief that "Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God." In his introductory note, Dr. Dods says, concerning this Gospel, that "in the whole range of literature there is no composition a more perfect work of art, or which more rigidly excludes whatever does not subserve its main end. From the first word to the last, there is no paragraph, sentence, or expression which is out of place, or with which we could dispense." The truth of this statement becomes very evident as one follows Dr. Dods in his lucid and masterly exposition of the Gospel.

Professor Stokes' volume is also a superior work. In it we are given an exposition of the Acts of the Apostles down to, but not including, the conversion of St. Paul and the baptism of Cornelius, *i. e.*, of the first nine chapters. It has to do, therefore, with the beginning of the Christian Church, and treats of the incidents therewith connected in a highly interesting and instructive manner. Though a decided Churchman, Professor Stokes has been careful to say nothing which can really hurt the feelings of any one occupying a different standpoint. His work, as well as that of Dr. Dods, is a valuable contribution to popular theological literature, and will repay study.

THE SERMON BIBLE. St. Luke I. to St. John III. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son, 51 East Tenth Street (near Broadway), 1891. Price, \$1.50.

This is the third volume of this work on the New Testament, and the seventh of the whole series. Its general features are in every respect the same as those of the preceding volumes, all of which have been noticed more or less fully in different numbers of this REVIEW. Rightly used, it is a work which will prove helpful to ministers generally. Its outlines of sermons are both suggestive and instructive, and its reference to works bearing on the different texts will be found especially serviceable.

ST. MATTHEW'S WITNESS to Words and Works of the Lord, or Our Saviour's Life as Revealed in the Gospel of His Earliest Evangelist. By Francis W. Upham, LL.D., Author of "The Church and Science: or, The Ancient Hebrew Idea of the Days of Creation," etc., etc. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.20.

The character of this work is well set forth on its title page. Its purpose is to direct attention to and explain the meaning of the words and works of Jesus as these are presented in the Gospel of St. Matthew. In its general character it is popular and practical, rather than critical. It is written in an easy, flowing and attractive style, and is in every way well suited to meet the wants of the general reader. It is a book that is worthy a place both in the family and in the Sunday-school library.

COMMENTARY ON THE OLD TESTAMENT. Vol. II. Leviticus, Numbers and Deuteronomy. *Leviticus and Numbers*, by Daniel Steele, D.D.; *Deuteronomy*, by John W. Lindsay, D.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, \$2.00.

This volume forms part of Whedon's Old and New Testament Commentary, the object of which is to furnish information concerning the Scriptures for popular use. It has accordingly been prepared, not so much with a view to the wants of the advanced student as to those of the general reader. On this account its character is predominantly expository, rather than critical. Nevertheless the work has been executed with great care and with due reference to the results of scientific and historical criticism, so that it is fully abreast the biblical knowledge of the times in which we live. In tone it is throughout thoroughly evangelical. For the purpose for which it is intended we know of no better commentary on the books of which it treats.

ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES. A Guide to the Study of the Sunday School Lessons for 1892, Including Original and Selected Expositions, Plans of Instruction, Illustrative Anecdotes, Practical Applications, Archaeological Notes, Library References, Maps, Pictures, Diagrams. By Jesse L. Hurlbut, D.D., and Robert R. Doherdy, Ph.D. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston and Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This work has been especially prepared for the benefit of Sunday-school teachers during the present year. In it the International Lessons for the year are carefully expounded and illustrated, and teachers are given hints for instruction and library references, by means of which they may attain still further knowledge of the subject under consideration. Of the various books of the kind it is one of the very best. No Sunday-school teacher who will study it carefully can fail to be well prepared to impart instruction to his pupils. The essence of a library may be truly said to be concentrated in this one volume.

BOSTON HOMILIES. Short Sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for 1892. By Members of the Alpha Chapter of the Convocation of the Boston University. Second Series. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price, \$1.25.

This volume consists, as stated on its title-page of homilies or short sermons on the International Sunday-school Lessons for the present year. These homilies have all been prepared with great care and furnish a large amount of useful information and instruction. They are more especially intended for the Sunday-school teachers and older scholars, but may be profitably read by all classes of persons. Ministers who are in the habit of lecturing on the Sunday-school lessons for the benefit of their Sunday-school teachers and scholars will particularly find them suggestive and helpful.

WESLEY ON ORATORY. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe, 1891. Price 10 cents.

This small booklet of twenty pages consists of an article on Oratory and Elocution by the distinguished founder of Methodism. It will amply repay careful reading, and should be thoroughly studied by all who would excel in public speaking.

CALENDAR AND CHART. Illustrating the Years, Periods and Events as Recorded in the Life of Our Lord, in their Chronological Order. Prepared for the Use of Sunday-schools, Normal Classes, etc. By George P. Perry. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price (cloth 5 feet square), \$3.50; mounted on rollers, \$5.00; Paper, size, 20x28, 40 cts.; folded in cloth cover, 75 cts.

This is an exceedingly convenient and instructive Calendar and Chart. By means of it the different events of the Life of Christ are so presented that by a single glance their various relations may be learned. We would heartily commend it to the attention of all ministers and Sunday-school Superintendents and workers.

PHARAOS, FELLAHS AND EXPLORERS. By Amelia B. Edwards. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brother, Franklin Square, 1892. Price, \$4.00.

This volume contains, with large additions, notes and references, the substance of a course of lectures recently delivered in this country by the author. In every respect it is a most delightful book. Its fine, heavy paper, its large, clear type, its many fine and interesting illustrations, and its handsome binding make it a perfect feast for the eyes, while its wonderful account of early civilization and art, its charming style, and its thorough and accurate learning make it a no less perfect feast for the imagination and the reason. We would advise our readers to secure a copy of it, and, if they do so, we feel assured they will not regret their purchase.

THE PEOPLE'S BIBLE. Discourses upon Holy Scripture. By Joseph Parker, D.D., Minister of the City Temple, Holborn Viaduct, London; Author of "Ecce Deus," "The Paraclete," "The Priesthood of Christ," "Springdale Abbey," "The Inner Life of Christ," "Ad Clerum," "The Ark of God," "Apostolic Life," "Tyne Chylde," "Weaver Stephen," "Every Morning," "The People's Family Prayer Book, etc., etc. Vol. XV.—Isaiah xxvii.—Jeremiah xix. New York, London and Toronto: Funk & Wagnalls Company. Price, \$1.50.

This is the fifteenth volume of the "People's Bible" on the Old Testament. As, however, six volumes of the work have been already published on the New Testament, this is really the twenty-first volume of the series. Only four more volumes will, therefore, be required to complete the work, and, considering the rapidity with which the different volumes have heretofore appeared, it will not be long now before the whole series will be published. When we think of the other works written by Dr. Parker, it is really surprising that

he should be able to complete in so short a time a work so extensive and so able as the "People's Bible," and his so doing is in itself a striking evidence of superior mental endowments on his part.

In merit the present volume is fully equal to any of those that have preceded it. The same brilliant rhetoric, happy exposition and striking application of divine truth, that have made the earlier volumes so popular, will be found in this also. Among the titles of topics discussed are the following: A Denunciation of Drunkenness; The Doom of Ariel; Plain Speaking; The Source of Strength; Prophetic Warnings; Unconscious Providences; Contending Emotions; Dramatized Truth; Divine Questions; etc.

FAITH, HOPE, LOVE AND DUTY. By Daniel Wise, J.D.D. Author of *Path of Life, Pleasant Pathways, Our King and Saviour, etc.* New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. 1891. Price, \$1.

This book is made up of short paragraphs, illustrative and explanatory of Christian faith, hope, love and duty. These paragraphs originally appeared as editorials in the columns of the *Zion's Herald*. They embody much important truth pithily expressed, and can scarcely fail to be spiritually and morally helpful to those who read them. We commend the book to the readers of this REVIEW as one that can profitably be taken up at odd moments.

